2012

Leadership Response to Workplace Bullying in Academe: A Collective Case Study

Colleen A. Hegranes
University of St. Thomas, Minnesota

Leadership Response to Workplace Bullying in Academe: A Collective Case Study

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS

By

Colleen A. Hegranes

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

August, 2012

UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS

We certify that we have read this dissertation and approved it as adequate in scope and quality for the degree of Doctor of Education and hereby approve the dissertation.

Dissertation Committee

Alla Heorhaidi, PhD, EdD, Committee Chair

John Conbere, EdD, Committee Member

Susan Huber, EdD, Committee Member

_____

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Three things in human life are important: the first is to be kind.
The second is to be kind. The third is to be kind.
–Henry James (1843-1916)

My deepest thanks to those who have been so kind throughout this process! Family, colleagues, friends, faculty, advisors, and my cherished "diss sisters," you have encouraged me, challenged me, supported me and loved me through the highs and lows of this remarkable journey. Without you, I could not have done it. Without you, I would not have wanted to do it!

I am grateful to my major professors, Dr. Alla Heorhiadi and Dr. John Conbere, exemplary teachers and scholars, who challenged and supported me throughout the doctoral program, freely sharing their knowledge, insights, and experience with me and all of us in Cohort V. Special thanks to Dr. Heorhiadi, my committee chair, whose energy and willingness to work with me under demanding timelines, made it possible for me to finish on time. I also wish to thank my committee members, Dr. John Conbere and Dr. Susan Huber for their helpful suggestions as I formulated the study, and for their support and encouragement throughout the process.

My thanks to my dear "diss sisters," Jane Canney, Amy Jauman, and Theresa Thompson, who got to the finish line before me, but stayed right there with their open hearts, shouting encouragement, sharing insights, and celebrating every milestone with me. They were my inspiration.

I am blessed to work with colleagues who have cheered me on and made it possible for me to accomplish this goal. I am grateful to Andrea J. Lee, IHM, my supervisor and mentor who persuaded me to seek this degree and supported me

throughout. My colleagues Brian Bruess and Stacy Jacobson were there whenever I needed advice or counsel or friendship. And the words of support and encouragement from my faculty and staff colleagues kept me motivated.

Most importantly, my thanks to Steve Hegranes, my husband and wonderful life partner, who has always been my most stalwart supporter, my anchor, my love. And to my mother, Avis, who always believed I could do more than I even dreamed possible and delighted in my every accomplishment. She was my greatest fan.

Finally, I want to thank the four CAOs who agreed to participate in this study. I am grateful for their open doors, their candor, and their interest in this topic. I learned a great deal from them. They are each and all, amazing academic leaders. It was an honor to work with them.

Kindness in words creates confidence.
Kindness in thinking creates profundity.
Kindness in giving creates love.
–Lao-Tse (b. 604 BC)

Colleen A. Hegranes St. Paul, Minnesota August, 2012

ABSTRACT

Workplace bullying is a type of harassing behavior that can have negative, even devastating, consequences for both employees and the organization, but because the abuse is status blind (not related to legally protected classes of race, gender, religion, national origin, physical or mental disability, age or sexual orientation), antiharassment and antidiscrimination laws do not adequately address this phenomenon. The unique status of faculty and the protections of academic freedom, tenure, and peer review present challenges for those dealing with cases of incivility and unprofessional behavior among and between faculty members.

This interpretive collective case study captured the experiences and responses of four private college senior academic leaders, Chief Academic Officers (CAOs), who had dealt with incidences of workplace bullying between faculty. Data analysis began with in-depth examination of each individual case, where participant interviews provided the primary sources and were triangulated with secondary-source interviews and review of available documents. The cross case analysis revealed three major themes: the influence of the environment and academic culture; the influence of the unique factors of faculty employment, especially the protections and entitlements of tenure; and strategies CAOs employed at the individual and systemic levels to address bullying.

The research is significant to the field of organization development in that it shines a spotlight on the challenges of addressing this incivility in the sheltered environment of academe. Insights gained through this study may be of value to academic leaders grappling with similar situations on their own campuses and may add to the body of workplace bullying literature regarding higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

Background

Most people think that bullying is about kids not getting along with other kids on the playground. The first full page of a Google search identifies more than a dozen dedicated websites providing information for kids and parents about bullying: what it is, how to recognize it, what to do about it. Oftentimes, adults believe that bullying is still a playground phenomenon that children will outgrow as they learn to navigate the world of interpersonal relationships and individual differences. Bullying does not have to be physical abuse; it can be limited to verbal and psychological abuse as well. In recent years there has been a great deal of media attention directed to the problem of bullying among children and adolescents, especially the extreme cases where bullying has allegedly resulted in victims' suicides. A recent ABC News report claimed that nearly 30% of students are either bullies or targets of bullying (Bullying Statistics, n.d.).

Until 5 years ago, I too believed bullying was a childhood experience. Two unrelated incidents changed that assumption. A faculty member who was having difficulty dealing with the incivility of a colleague forwarded a magazine article to me about bullying in the workplace. I no longer have the article, but I recall both the article and my skepticism about it well. Then in late summer 2010, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported the suicide of Kevin Morrissey, who was an editor of the *Virginia Quarterly Review* at the University of Virginia (Wilson, 2010). The article detailed the workplace environment and pointed to an atmosphere of bullying, much of which was said to be directed at Mr. Morrissey.

Gray Namie and Ruth Namie, founders of the Workplace Bullying Institute and authors of *The Bully at Work* (2009), describe workplace bullying as an epidemic in the contemporary workplace. According to the results of their Workplace Bullying Survey, 37% of American workers reported being bullied either currently or in the past. An additional 12 % said they had witnessed it in their workplaces. However, unlike harassment, workplace bullying is not illegal. Still, it does exist and is particularly difficult to address. When it occurs between or among colleagues in academic institutions, the effects can be far-reaching and destructive, not only to those involved, but to the institution as well. The unique conditions of peer review can provide unintended protections for perpetrators and roadblocks for those trying to address the problem. Thus, when it gets as far as the senior leadership level, the severity and ramifications are significant for all involved.

As my awareness of the phenomenon increased, it piqued my interest in workplace bullying, specifically in the area of higher education. I was particularly interested in how academic leaders have dealt with situations involving faculty.

Statement of the Problem

Andrea Adams coined the term *workplace bullying* in 1988 (Namie & Namie, 2009) describing a type of harassing behavior not related to race or gender that can have negative, even devastating consequences for both employees and for the organization. My particular interest is faculty-on-faculty bullying in higher education. The unique status of faculty and the protections of their social contract of tenure and peer review (Hamilton, 2008), present challenges for those dealing with cases of incivility and unprofessional behavior among and between faculty members. When faculty evade

confrontation, administrators are left to deal with the consequences. If administrative leaders evade confrontation, this may signal approval of "future perpetuation of incivility" (Twale & DeLuca, 2008, p. 8). Yet, despite the growth of the problem, there seem to be few models for addressing this incivility. Given the factors of shared governance, peer review, and tenure protections, academic administrators face unique challenges as they attempt to address individual cases of faculty-on-faculty bullying.

Purpose of the Study and Research Question

The purpose of this research study was to examine and understand the response of university academic leadership to bullying behaviors in faculty. My intention was to understand the experience of senior leaders dealing with faculty who are bullies and the targets of bullies. Through the study of college and university senior administrators, I sought to describe how academic administrators address instances of workplace bullying between faculty in light of the unique factors of employment—tenure, peer review, and academic freedom—in higher education. My research question was, how do university leaders respond to instances of workplace bullying that involve faculty?

Significance of the Study

My own experience and conversations with colleagues throughout the years led me to believe this is not an uncommon situation on college and university campuses, but it is seldom discussed or addressed. Everyone seems to have a story to tell, usually with no satisfactory resolution. The results of this research may expand awareness of the phenomenon of academic bullying and provide helpful ideas for how academic administrators can address the problem of faculty bullying.

The research is significant to the field of organization development in higher education in that it shines a spotlight on the subtleties of adult bullying behaviors and the challenges of addressing this incivility in the sheltered environment of academe. Insights gained through this study may be of value to academic leaders grappling with similar situations on their own campuses and may add to the body of workplace bullying literature regarding higher education,

Definition of Common Terms

Workplace bullying. Namie and Namie (2011) defined workplace bullying as: the repeated, health-harming mistreatment of an employee by one or more employees through acts of commission or omission manifested as: verbal abuse; behaviors—physical or nonverbal—that are threatening, intimidating, or humiliating; work sabotage, interference with production; exploitation of a vulnerability—physical, social, or psychological; or some combination of one or more categories (p. 13).

Chief Academic Officer (CAO). The CAO is the senior administrator responsible for all aspects of the academic programs of the university including oversight of faculty and academic administrative staff. There are several other **organizational** titles for this position—vice president for academic affairs, executive or senior vice president, dean, provost—but in every case, CAO is either stated or understood in their titles. This study refers to the senior academic leaders as CAOs regardless of their specific titles.

Target. Namie and Namie (2009) identified a victim of bullying as a target to suggest that, while targets are the recipients of unwarranted bullying, they must avoid the

helplessness of victimhood. Victims are most often powerless and unable to address or escape their situations.

Harassment. In contrast to bullying, harassment is the illegal abuse of a person's civil rights. The person is typically a member of a protected class such as race, gender, age, sexual orientation, or disability. Workplaces are bound by law to enforce protections for these classes and to take appropriate action against violators. Although bullying is a form of harassment, the key difference is that it is "status-blind" (not related to legally protected classes of race, gender, religion, national origin, physical or mental disability, age or sexual orientation)**,** and is not legally actionable (Yamada, 2000).

Peer review. Higher education faculty engage in peer review in order to advise the university regarding individual faculty member's eligibility for appointment, promotion, and tenure.

> In the tradition of the peer-review professions [e.g., law, medicine, education], the members of a profession [faculty] and society [the university] form an unwritten social contract whereby society grants the profession autonomy to govern itself and in return the members of the profession agree to meet correlative personal and collegial group duties to society. The profession's autonomy to regulate itself translates into substantial autonomy and discretion in work for the individual professional. (Hamilton, 2008, p. 178)

Academic freedom. The principle of academic freedom as articulated in the American Association of University Professors *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* (2006) protects the rights of teachers to conduct research

and present subject matter in their classrooms without fear of reprisal. It further protects their rights to express their opinions as private citizens without fear of reprisal.

Tenure. Faculty earn tenure through demonstrating exceptional performance in teaching, research and scholarship, and service to the institution. The primary rationale for tenure is to protect the professor's academic freedom, particularly in the areas of teaching and scholarship. Once tenured, a faculty member is assured that her or his contract and rank will not be terminated without just cause, a very high standard.

Summary

Bullying is not restricted to the school yard, either literally or figuratively; nor is it restricted to certain industries or to members of protected status groups (Namie & Namie, 2009). It exists in any workplace, including the halls and offices of the ivory tower of academe. Twale and DeLuca (2008) posited that faculty may accept incivility and bullying as "a trade-off for the personal autonomy they enjoy" (p. 149) but warned that the consequences of allowing a bully culture to exist will have negative consequences, not only for those directly involved but also for the institution long-term. This study focused on the experiences of senior leaders in higher education who have experience dealing with instances of workplace bullying between or among faculty. I was specifically interested in how they approached and responded to these situations. The study is significant in that it may offer applicable insights for academic leaders grappling with this phenomenon on their campuses or add to the body of workplace bullying literature relating to higher education.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The initial search for relevant literature focused on the concept of adult bullying in the workplace, particularly between and among faculty members within the confines of higher education. Database searches included ERIC, Academic Source Premier, Dissertations and Theses, and Psych INFO, with keywords workplace bullying, harassment, mobbing, higher education, and faculty incivility. I also incorporated information gleaned from higher-education newspapers and newsletters as well as websites and recently published books.

Workplace Bullying

In a speech delivered at the British Trade Union Manufacturing, Science and Finance conference in 1994, Andrea Adams, the British journalist who is credited with coining the phrase workplace bullying, described it as "one of the most stressful, destructive, humiliating and financially undermining forces at large"(Adams, 1994). Workplace bullying encompasses a broad range of repeatedly aggressive behaviors including exploitation, power plays, defamation of character, lack of civility, authoritarian management style, arbitrary favoritism, verbal abuse and belittling, and hostile communication directed at a specific target (Braithwaite, 2001; Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; Namie & Namie, 2009; Weiner, 2002).

Namie and Namie (2011) developed a continuum of negative behavior ranging from disrespect and incivility, such as angry outbursts and intimidating comments to abusive activities, such as haranguing and berating and, at its most extreme, to threatening physical harm or safety. Most often, workplace bullying is "psychologically violent—sublethal and nonphysical—a mix of verbal and strategic assaults to prevent the

Target from performing work well" (Namie & Namie, 2011, p. 13). Bullying moves beyond simple conflict when it is specifically directed at another person, the target, and when it is persistent over a period of time. Most often, the abuse escalates over time when left unchallenged. Given these factors, it is not surprising that the National Institute for Occupational Safety recognizes workplace bullying as a form of workplace violence (Namie & Namie, 2009). The damage that bullies inflict permeates the organization and is reflected in the high cost of turnover, distracted and demoralized employees, and high levels of absenteeism (Sutton, 2007).

The 2007 Zogby Poll, *U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey* (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2008, as cited in Namie & Namie, 2009) showed that 37% of American workers had been bullied and an additional 12% had witnessed but never experienced being bullied. Keashley and Neuman (2010) cited several studies that found coworkers to be the most frequent sources of bullying behaviors. In the majority of cases (61%) bullying involved same-gender harassment (Namie & Namie, 2009).

It is important to note the contrasts and comparisons between policies prohibiting bullying and harassment and efforts to engage conflict resolution or management efforts as remedies. Harassment is most often a subset of universities' policies regarding sexual harassment, which are mandated by law. In this case, situations are actionable only when they involve sexual misconduct or harassing behaviors directed against protected classes such as age, race, sex, or religious affiliation. In many states this also includes sexual orientation. Bullying is a status-blind activity, usually involving power differential but not generally directed at a target based on status protected by law.

Namie and Namie (2011) argued strongly that the conflict resolution strategy of mediation is not the appropriate approach to dealing with bullies because the purpose of mediation is to consider the needs and interests of both parties. In cases of bullying, the imbalance of power is evident in the fact that one person is the victim or target while the other is the perpetrator or bully. Keashley and Nowell (2011) pointed out that the process of mediation is not designed to discipline bad actors but rather to mediate the situation so as to move forward without sanctions. Most importantly, the authors argued that much like domestic violence, bullying is a form of violence and violence is not a matter for mediation.

The Academic Workplace

Workplace bullying consultants, Namie and Namie (2009), found some of the highest rates of bullying in the field of education. The unique structure of higher education institutions provides an environment in which bullying can flourish (Keashley & Neuman, 2010). Historically organized on a faculty-centered, faculty-run model, the modern-day university has evolved as a hierarchical business organization and an academic institution simultaneously, generally allotting responsibility for the business operations relegated to administrators while responsibilities for the academic programs remain within the purview of the faculty. The inevitable overlap of responsibilities and authority creates a state of tension between faculty and administration.

In the general population 72% of the reported bullies are bosses (Namie & Namie, 2009); however, in a 2008 study conducted with university employees, Keashley and Neuman (2010) found that faculty members were more likely to identify colleagues, rather than administrative superiors, as bullies. Rank and tenure give faculty power,

privilege, and protection not available to others in the institution. The imbalance of power and the existence of peer review and academic freedom can give rise to competition and a climate that is vulnerable to incivility and harassment. Furthermore, the tenets of self-governance contribute to a sense of entitlement and expectation of autonomy that can replace an atmosphere of collegiality and professional respect with one of competitiveness and passive—or active—aggression (Fogg, 2008; Hamilton, 2008; Keashley & Neuman, 2010; O'Meara, 2004; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). The tension created by the paradox of collegiality and competition is strengthened by the particularly unique circumstances of the university structure and governance, where faculty rank and tenure processes are predominantly faculty driven. The power imbalance between senior and junior faculty members is fertile ground for academic bullies to plant doubts about the person's competence, scholarship, or suitability to the department. Such attempts to undermine professional standing often go ignored. The cultural reality that confrontation is not encouraged contributes to a toxic climate of incivility (Keashley & Neuman, 2010).

Prolonged incivility can easily become the norm with few faculty willing to challenge the bully. Simpson and Cohen (2004) observed that issues relating to the bully climate—power, control, and change—are particularly pertinent to higher education, where faculty are seldom held accountable and tenured faculty bullies cannot be terminated easily. They found that the most prevalent forms of bullying were unfair criticism, intimidation, and the withholding of information. The behaviors of faculty bullies are most often nuanced and embedded in intellectual posturing called academic discourse or in obstructionist resource decisions. In other words, the most frequently described bullying behaviors involve withholding resources or threats to the target's

professional reputation, particularly in the area of scholarship and knowledge creation. All is happening under the guise of academic freedom and discourse (Nelson & Lambert, 2001). Overtly threatening behaviors such as angry outbursts, swearing, stereotyping, shouting, or physical threats do not often occur, most likely because such behavior would violate the academic norms of civility and easily expose the bully to others in the department (Keashley & Neuman, 2010).

Employer Response

The 2007 Zogby Poll, *U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey* (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2008, as cited in Namie & Namie, 2009) found employers ignoring 44% of the reported cases and actually making 18% worse. Only 1.7% conducted fair investigations that protected the targets from further bullying with negative consequences for the bully. In 31% of the cases the investigations resulted in no consequences for the bullies and retaliation against the target. Since workplace bullying takes place within an organization regulated by operating policies and systems, "it is always and by definition the responsibility of the organization and its management" (Einarsen et al., 2011, p. 30) to address the issue.

The literature strongly suggests that the organizational climate and culture are central to the existence or absence of bullying. Developing and maintaining a climate where there are significant consequences for those who are found to be bullies and where complaints are taken seriously, can contribute to an organization where harassment and incivility are not tolerated (Hoel & Salin, 2003; Twale & DeLuca, 2008; Duffy, 2009; Georgakopoulos, Wilkin, & Brianna, 2011; Kent, Hoel & Einarsen, 2011). Zapf and Einarsen (2001) proposed a theoretical framework for the management of bullying at

work emphasizing the importance of both an effective support system for the target and prohibitive policies with consequences for the bullies. The model also emphasizes the importance of attentiveness to organizational patterns and methods of operation that may contribute to the existence of the bully culture.

To date, much of the literature regarding workplace bullying has focused on identifying and describing the bullying phenomenon and its effects; by contrast there has been little focus on the effectiveness of various models of intervention and prevention. Furthermore, there has been relatively little attention to models tailored to leaders in higher education in spite of evidence that bullying is not uncommon in academic institutions.

A Young Field

Identification of bullying as a destructive, health-harming force in the workplace environment began in Europe in the early 1990s with the work of Swedish physician and scientist, Heinz Leymann. The work spread throughout Europe and to the United States near the end of the decade. Thus, the academic field of workplace bullying is barely 25-years-old and a preponderance of the literature is from Europe, particularly the Scandinavian countries (Namie & Namie, 2009). Although recent studies have found high incidences of bullying in higher education (Keashley & Neuman, 2010; Namie & Namie, 2009), most of the literature has focused on the general population. Specific attention to higher education issues has focused on the academic climate and culture (Simpson & Cohen, 2004) and the impact of the tension between autonomy and collegiality (Fogg, 2008; Hamilton, 2008; Keashley & Neuman, 2010; O'Meara, 2004; Twale & DeLuca, 2008).

There are suggestions in the literature for developing models to address bullying in the organization (Zapf & Einarsen, 2001), but none that pertain specifically to higher education and the unique factors of peer review, academic freedom and tenure. Further discussion of this and additional literature in relation to the findings may be found in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The case study methodology for this research is grounded in the epistemology of interpretivism. Interpretive, or in other terms qualitative, research seeks to understand how people construct meaning and make sense of their world and their experiences (Creswell, 2007, Crotty, 1998; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995). According to Merriam (2009) a defining characteristic of interpretive research is that the researcher is the "primary instrument for data collection," working from the particular to the general (p. 15). With self-as-instrument, the researcher pursues an inductive process, examining the individual experience to look for the larger patterns and themes that help make meaning of the experience. The inductive approach of interpretive research does not require a theory or hypothesis as a starting point. Rather, the flexibility of the process allows the researcher to explore the subject in depth and analyze the data looking for themes that may be helpful to others interested in further research in this area

The focus of this research study was the response of academic leaders to bullying behaviors in faculty. My intention was to understand the experience of leaders dealing with bullying between and among faculty. I also wanted to describe their approaches and responses to bullies on their campuses. My research question was: *How do university leaders respond to incidents of workplace bullying that involve faculty?*

Research Design and Rationale

In conducting this study, I wanted to understand the experiences of academic administrators who have dealt with bullying, from the emic, or insider's (Patton, 2002), perspective. I chose to conduct an interpretive, multiple-case study, also known as collective-case study. An interpretive-case study involves the detailed and intensive

analysis of a particular situation or condition within a bounded system. A multiple-case study involves data collection from more than one case. Stake (2006) described multiple-case study research as "a particular collection of cases [where] the individual cases share a common characteristic or condition [and] the cases are somehow categorically bound together" (pp. 5-6). In this study the quintain, the common characteristic or phenomenon being studied, was the CAO response to workplace bullying between faculty in the university. I chose the multiple-case study method because I wanted to delve deeply into the experiences of academic leaders who have dealt with the complex challenges of addressing faculty bullying. The multiple-case study methodology provided the opportunity to explore the phenomenon in detail across several cases. My goal was to understand the experiences of higher education administrators who were required to respond to reported instances of workplace bullying that involved faculty. My intent was to study and analyze several individual cases first, and then to cross-analyze them looking for themes. Studying several cases allowed me to learn different perspectives as well as common themes or approaches to dealing with workplace bullying.

Participant Selection

My goal was to identify CAOs who would be willing to participate in the study of how institutional leaders respond to cases of bullying involving faculty. In order to identify several institutional participants for this research, I sent a letter to my network of colleagues who are academic administrators in private higher education institutions inviting them to participate in this study (Appendix A). The invitation provided a description of the phenomenon of faculty bullying and asked whether they or any other leaders at their institutions had dealt with such instances within the last 5 years.

Nine CAOs responded to my request and after discussion regarding the logistics of time and travel, five agreed to participate. Stake (2006) recommended a minimum of four cases in order to gather enough data to identify patterns and themes. I ultimately had four participants due to extenuating circumstances causing one to drop out of the study. Of the four participants, one was a CAO whom I had never met. The remaining three were acquaintances I had met through professional organizations. In addition, I asked the CAOs to identify two to four faculty and or staff who were familiar with recent cases of bullying at the institution. I made it clear that it was my intention to avoid meeting with participants who were targets of, or accused of, bullying. While their side of the story may be of interest in another study, I was most interested in how organizations and their leaders respond to the phenomenon of bullying, not to the actual experience of bullying or being bullied. I ultimately interviewed two additional participants from each campus. The triangulation of data sources helped me develop a broader perspective of the institutional response to bullying (Patton, 2002; Stake, 2006).

Prior to meeting with them, I sent each participant a brief description of the project including the definition of workplace bullying and the purpose of the study. At the beginning of each interview I presented the participants with the consent form approved by the Institutional Review Board and explained the confidentiality provision of the agreement. All participants were assured that their identities and interview records would be confidential and that recordings and transcriptions would be destroyed upon completion of the project. I assigned pseudonyms to protect the privacy of individuals and their institutions and all data collected was kept in a secure space. Furthermore, I assured participants that the final research project and any ensuing articles would not

contain information that would identify the individuals or their institutions. Participants were asked to sign a consent form indicating that they had been informed of this commitment to confidentiality and agreeing to participate in the study (Appendix B).

Methods of Data Collection

Interpretive research is designed to help the researcher study a particular issue or phenomenon in-depth. As such, the researcher does not have a prescribed method of data collection, but rather the freedom to follow details in order to fully, or deeply, understand the experience of the participant(s) being studied (Patton, 2002). My research sought to bring to light how leaders in different institutions have responded to workplace bullying. The methods included participant interviews for the purpose of triangulation and review of websites, as well as documents and institutional policies wherever available.

Interviews. I arranged to conduct interviews in whatever setting the participants chose. I interviewed three of the four CAOs in their offices and the fourth by phone due to travel issues. Most of the secondary participant interviews were on-campus, in-person interviews, but a few were by phone and one by Skype. I prepared an interview guide of topics to be addressed in the interview. The goal of each interview was to fully understand the experience and perspective of the interviewee. The interview guide, prepared in advance of the interviews, helped ensure that the same basic information was gathered in each interview but still allowed for further probing in the effort to gather robust data (Patton, 2002). The interview guide is included in Appendix C. The interviews ranged from 60-90 minutes and were recorded and fully transcribed to facilitate recollection. I also took notes during the interviews and kept a journal to record my reflections, reactions, or ideas immediately following the interviews.

Documents. I examined faculty handbooks and other appropriate documents where they were available. These documents provided further context for information gathered in the interviews.

Organization of data. The materials were collected and organized in a simple case study database to aid analysis and retrieval of data. I kept all electronic data, such as correspondence with participants, transcriptions, my journal, and other documents or worksheets I created to aid in the analysis process. I kept hard-copy materials, such as documents provided by participants, my original interview notes, signed consent forms, printed copies of transcripts, and schema and maps I created during the analysis process in paper files.

Methods of Data Analysis

The analysis process of qualitative data is not a linear process. It is more fluid, "moving back and forth between the phenomenon of interest and our abstractions of that phenomenon, between the descriptions of what has occurred and our interpretations of those descriptions, between the complexity of reality and our simplifications of those complexities" (Patton, 2002, p. 480-481). The collective, or multicase study repeats this process for each case, and then again in the cross-case analysis. The purpose of collective or multicase research is to understand the quintain, the collection of cases. The analysis begins with an intensive, in-depth analysis of each case and then moves to a cross-case analysis looking for patterns and themes from the cases that will help describe and understand the quintain of CAO response to workplace bullying in academe (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2006).

Within-case analysis. The emphasis of the within-case analysis is on providing a full-bodied description of the case (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002; Stake, 2006). The analysis of data for this study consisted of careful reading and rereading of interview transcripts, collected documents, and my own journal of observations and reflective memos. Incorporating the recommendations of Foss and Waters (2007) and Merriam (2009), I embarked on the following steps to analyze the data for each case:

1. All interviews were recorded, then transcribed and printed with line numbers using pseudonyms for the participants and their institutions.
2. I reviewed the transcriptions several times and added margin notes to the transcripts while keeping a second running list of key concepts or words that emerged.
3. I transcribed and printed my own post-interview notes with line numbers and reviewed them in comparison to transcript notes, adding margin notes as I did so.
4. I then compiled a document with quotations from the transcripts and my own notes, all with corresponding line numbers.
5. Next, I began cutting and sorting into piles as recommended by Foss and Waters (2007) and Merriam (2009). As I did so I discovered that the system of applying a coding rubric, which I had devised, to margin notes and key words was not helpful for the next step.
6. I then turned to large sheet of newsprint and, with a variety of colored markers, began mapping key words, quotes, and observations.

7. Finally, I once again reviewed the interview transcriptions while listening to the tapes to be sure I was capturing the essence of the interviews, as well as the words.
8. As I did this, the prevailing themes of the case emerged.

This system of hand coding and mapping kept me close to the data and affirmed my confidence in the themes and patterns I identified. I also found that the document I had created of interview quotations and my own observations was a handy cross-check. As I wrote each case description, I referred frequently to the map posted on my wall as well as to the original transcripts to be sure that I was representing the case accurately and reaching defensible interpretations of themes and patterns.

I then moved to the next stage.

Cross-case analysis. After analyzing the individual cases, I conducted a cross-case analysis to identify themes across the individual cases. The goal was to develop a collective description that highlighted the similarities and differences across the cases. The goal of cross-case analysis is to relate the findings of the individual cases to the question of the quintain (Stake, 2006). In this case the quintain is the CAOs' responses to academic bullying.

To begin, I reviewed the findings of each case, looking for patterns relating to the quintain. I then used Merriam's (2009) constant comparative method to compare and group similar data. Returning to my newsprint and mapping approach, I listed themes and categories from the first case. I repeated the process with the second case, noting where themes overlapped or could be combined, and where new ones emerged. As each case was added the patterns became clearer. Some categories became less important

while others were strengthened by the additional case findings. A final examination of the categories resulted in combining some while eliminating others, resulting in three major themes of the research.

Validity

Triangulation. The purpose of triangulation is to increase the credibility of the findings through the use of multiple sources of data (Merriam, 2009). This was accomplished through interviews of secondary participants, review of websites and available documents, and journaling.

Member checking. Each participant was invited to review the interview transcripts and the preliminary description of the case to insure accuracy and allow for modifications. One CAO responded with minor clarifications.

Memoing. The process of journaling included recording thoughts and assumptions prior to the interviews and throughout the process. The purpose of the journal was twofold. It allowed me to record my impressions and thoughts regarding the interviews, catch an interesting thought during interviews, put down preliminary ideas for analysis. The other function of memoing was that it also helped me to identify any biases I could be bringing to the study. With memos I made sure I kept my response to information separate from the data I was collecting.

Researcher bias. Because I have been involved as an academic administrator in cases of bullying between faculty members in my own institution, I have some understanding of this phenomenon and I may better understand what participants mean. In an effort to minimize my own bias I was careful to record assumptions and opinions

prior to the interviews in an attempt to avoid contaminating my data and, ultimately, my findings.

Summary

The research question, *how do university leaders respond to instances of workplace bullying that involve faculty*, focused this research study on the response of academic leadership to bullying behaviors in faculty in higher education. My intention was to understand the individual and aggregate experience of leaders dealing with faculty who are bullies. The data was gathered through interviews and examination of pertinent policies and documents, where available. Analysis encompassed each individual case, followed by a cross-case analysis of the within-case findings, which identified commonalities and differences across the cases.

CHAPTER 4

Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine and understand the response of university academic leadership to bullying behaviors in faculty. I was interested in examining the experience of leaders who have dealt with faculty who are bullies and the targets of bullies. Through the study of college or university senior administrators, the research was designed to describe and understand how senior college or university administrators address instances of workplace bullying between faculty, especially in light of the unique factors of employment—tenure, peer review, and academic freedom—in higher education. The research question I explored was, how do university leaders (CAOs) respond to instances of workplace bullying that involve faculty? I used a multiple or collective-case study methodology, with academic leaders from four private colleges. The senior leader of each institution was considered to be a case. The four cases formed the quintain with the common phenomenon of CAOs' responses to workplace bullying of faculty.

This chapter consists of an in-depth presentation and discussion of each individual case. Each presentation includes data gathered from a) primary participants' interviews, b) secondary participants' interviews conducted either in person or by phone or Skype, c) review of documents and the four institutions' websites, and c) field notes observations. In three of the four institutions I was able to complete the interviews with the chief academic officer and the secondary participants in one visit, thus making it possible to focus on one case at a time throughout the interviews. Each individual presentation concludes with a summary of the case.

The chapter concludes with findings from the cross-case analysis. This cross-case analysis led to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of CAO responses to work place bullying involving faculty. The purpose of cross-case analysis is to understand the quintain thoroughly. Merriam (2009) provided a succinct description of the processes of within-case and cross-case analysis:

> For within-case analysis, each case is first treated as a comprehensive case in and of itself. . . . [then] cross-case analysis begins. . . . Although the particular details of a specific case may vary, the researcher attempts to build a general explanation that fits the individual cases. (Yin, 2008, as cited in Merriam, 2009)

Stake, (2006), described the process similarly: "the multicase research[er] . . . starts with a quintain, arranges to study cases in terms of their own situations issues, interprets patterns within each case, and analyses cross case findings to make assertions about the binding" (p. 10). In this study the quintain, or phenomenon, being studied is the CAO response to bullying between faculty.

Participant Profiles

Four CAOs participated in this study as primary participants representing four private colleges or universities. I chose to limit the scope of this study to private institutions in order to avoid working with institutions dealing with state mandates or faculty unions. In three of the four cases, I had a professional acquaintance with the CAO prior to the study. I also interviewed two, and in one case three, additional faculty or administrators as secondary participants on each campus for the purpose of triangulation. All participants and their institutions are identified by pseudonyms to protect their privacy. The range of time the participants had served as CAOs in their

current institutions ranged from 4 years to 8 years. The institutional size ranged from 2,000 to 5,200 students, with the number of full-time faculty ranging from 170-500. Personal profiles of CAOs and secondary participants are found in Tables 1 and 2.

Consistent with most other higher education institutions, the faculty relationship to the college in each of these cases is described and defined in the faculty handbook or the constitution of the faculty. These documents typically outline the roles and responsibilities of faculty and administration; the protections of academic freedom, peer review and tenure; and the framework for shared governance. The constitution, or handbook, forms the basis of the contractual agreement between the faculty and the institution.

Table 1

Personal Profiles of Participants: Chief Academic Officers (CAOs)

Participant Pseudonym	Title	Institution Pseudonym	#Students	#Faculty	Time in Current Position
Karmann	Provost	Adams College	1,980	170	5
Barbara	VPAA	Barrymore College	4,000	200	7
Rosemary	Provost	Clearly College	3,900	377	8
Denise	EVP & Provost	Draper College	5,200	400	6

Note. VPAA = Vice President Academic Affairs; EVP = Executive Vice President. Pseudonyms were used for participants and their institutions to ensure anonymity.

Table 2

Secondary Participants

Institution	Participant	Position
Adams College	Robert	Associate Academic Dean
Adams College	Carol	Faculty & Director, Faculty Development
Barrymore College	Joan	Associate Director, Human Resources
Barrymore College	Peter	Faculty & Department Chair
Barrymore College	James	Dean (School)
Cleary College	Mary	Director, Human Resources
Cleary College	Virginia	Faculty & former Department Chair
Draper	Margaret	Faculty & Director, Faculty Development
Draper	Frances	Dean (School)

Note. Pseudonyms were used for participants and their institutions to ensure anonymity.

Individual Case Profiles

The following individual cases are presented in the order which I completed the participant interviews for each campus. In some instances I edited quotes to delete swear words or run-on sentences, but did not change the essence of what was said.

Case 1: Karmann, Provost, Adams College

Adams College: the context. Adams is a private, coeducational liberal arts college located in the upper Midwest. This small, highly selective college with slightly less than 2,000 full-time students was founded as a Protestant-affiliated, but nonsectarian, independent institution late 19th century. At the time of this study, more than 90% of the 170 full-time faculty members held the doctorate or highest degree in their field. Promotion and tenure processes and decisions reflected a faculty deeply committed to active scholarship, excellent teaching, and extensive service.

At Adams College, faculty have a strong voice in the governance of the institution and a heightened sense of authority or influence over all matters of the institution's operations. One participant, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Robert, offered that this sense of power is, "steeped in Adam's history and social context," and stemmed from conflicts with the administration in the early 1990s.

> One of the interesting things that happened is that we had a president who had a very strong vision for where Adams was going to go and you had a faculty who didn't agree. So, you had a president who moved things ahead and a number of faculty who felt insulted, demoralized, and the rest, to the point where they tried to go to the Board of Trustees. And when the president finally left, resigned, the faculty felt like they had a victory, like they were instrumental in the decision. So now you have a faculty with a sense of heightened power and you have a faculty that is wary of administration as a result of this. And you have a divide [between faculty and administration] that probably exists everywhere, but is even stronger here.

Tenure is a dearly held faculty value. Policies and procedures regarding promotion and tenure are carefully delineated and followed, while expectations for professional conduct are somewhat vague. The institution's website contains a strong statement of zero tolerance for harassment of any kind, but there is no specific policy regarding bullying behavior. Formal complaints or grievances about bullying are handled through the College Harassment Committee. Adams College Provost, Karmann, finds the policy "a bit muddied because it focuses on sexual harassment and sexual assault when what we are usually talking about is a hostile environment." All proceedings of the

committee are confidential and relayed to the provost only when the committee has determined a need for sanctions. Karmann acknowledged her discomfort with the current practice,

> Yes, I will admit that I hate the system that is in place, but we do follow it quite religiously. Still, it is hard to be the provost and not be allowed to know any of this is going on.

It is within this context that the provost, the chief academic officer of Adams College, must address incidents of bullying between or among her faculty.

Interviewing Karmann. Karmann's office is located in a suite with the president of the college. Two long parallel corridors lead from the reception area to either Karmann's office or the president's. Bookcases in the reception area feature books by Adams College faculty. The corridor walls host a gallery of former presidents—all men—of the institution dating back 140 years to the founder and first president. At the end of the corridor, the door opens to a spacious, bright, corner office overlooking the campus quad.

Although the semester had ended and no summer school classes were in session, the campus was alive with the activities of the college's annual Alumni Reunion. Karmann would be involved in gatherings later that day as featured speaker and as designated "glad-hander" on behalf of the president. I have known Karmann as a professional acquaintance for several years, but this was my first time in her office. Reflecting its occupant, the office is uncluttered, almost spare, but with the warm, personal touches of a few carefully-selected pictures, favorite books, and a set of well-worn architectural plans for an academic building currently under construction.

Karmann's academic career began as a faculty member in the performing arts at another small, highly-selective liberal arts college where she progressed quickly through the ranks to full professor, department chair, and dean, and then moved on to become chief academic officer at a liberal arts college in the South for 3 years. From there she moved to Adams where she had just completed her 4th year as provost at the time of this study.

Experiences with situations of bullying at this institution. When I asked Karmann to tell me about her experience with faculty bullying she described two situations in which she had been involved over the last 4 years and a third in which she herself had been the target of a bully. Although the situations and the bullying behaviors differed, Karmann observed that they

> always have some sense of power differential. In most instances it's between a chair and pre-tenured faculty, but in one it was gender based where it was a senior male faculty member who simply thought, even though he wasn't the chair, he could—and has for decades—bully the women in his department. So, behaviors; in the most obvious ones, it's actually yelling and constantly challenging the position of the person being bullied in a very loud and threatening voice. And to some extent, I think trying to gain support from other people.

Especially difficult for Karmann had been the personal bullying she endured from a faculty member who had served as provost under the previous president of Adams. "Her approach is simply to disagree publicly with virtually every statement I make or stand that I take. And, well for a while when I was new it felt like I couldn't do my job here." Adding to the problem was the fact that the former provost had a wide span of

influence within certain groups of faculty. Associate Dean Robert opined that the former provost's influence was particularly strong among faculty because they ascribed some level of expertise to her given her background as a former provost: "Folks who have not been provost don't really know how decisions get made, how funds get allocated, and if folks are not in that position, then she [former provost] sounds reasonable because for them it's a black hole."

I asked Karmann to tell me how instances of bullying between or among faculty typically would come to her attention as provost. In some cases, faculty who felt they were being bullied either approached her directly or were referred to her via the director of faculty development. In rare instances she received and acted on the results of a formal grievance process; and, in one instance, Karmann observed a situation that "was so obvious that by the middle of my 1st year here, I had to step in." Although the behaviors varied with the circumstances, the commonality was that cases "have always been with some sense of power differential."

Karmann recounted two cases as examples of bullying instances involving faculty at Adams College. The first instance involved a "senior person who was chair and a pretenure [junior] faculty member who was just getting killed." The bullying behaviors included demeaning comments about the junior faculty member's teaching and about the quality and quantity of her research, as well as intimidating comments about her prospects for receiving tenure. The junior faculty member was reluctant to complain for fear of jeopardizing her prospects for tenure. Only when it became unbearable did she bring her concerns to the provost. In the second case, the senior faculty member was not the chair, but a long-time member of the department, described by many as a veteran

bully. In this case he was continually undermining the junior faculty member in meetings, calling out her mistakes in front of her colleagues, and given to shouting and pounding his fists on the table when he disapproved of something she said or did. In this instance, the junior faculty member ultimately decided to file a grievance charging "The Yeller" with creating a hostile environment for women through the College Harassment Committee.

As Director of Faculty Development, Carol is a confidential resource for faculty who need consultation or advice on a wide range of issues related to their academic life. As she reflected on the last few years, she observed that younger faculty were more apt to use the term *bullying* than their more senior colleagues when describing uncivil behavior. She recounted recent meetings with some faculty chairs who wanted to address issues of bullying in their departments. In spite of being department chairs, they all felt disadvantaged because none were senior members of their departments.

> The culture here is to hide our dirty laundry. "We want to handle this internally; we don't want to take them out and embarrass our colleagues. We don't want to rat out our colleagues to the provost." And people think they ought to be able to handle it themselves, but they have no training or tools to deal with it. . . . And there are people who come and talk to me and say "Oh, I had this awful experience with such and such a person, I don't know what to do." People show up again and again with these stories. And what is most interesting is that there are three names that come up over and over, but no one will confront.

When asked why faculty might be reluctant to confront inappropriate behavior, Robert replied:

> That's the real question, isn't it? I think some of it comes from this collegiality thing. And I say it in that particular way because I think collegiality means so many different things to a lot of people. To most folks here it means you don't rock the boat, it means you don't argue. Collegiality means we look out for each other, especially when it comes to faculty in the room with staff and administrators. And, there is the factor of tenure—having it or not having it. If nothing else, the person who doesn't have tenure feels vulnerable. They feel that saying something could very much affect their prospects for getting tenure and for all the things that go with it.

CAO intervention or response. Whether the complaint comes through a committee process, or directly from a target of bullying, it is the provost's responsibility to respond to the situation. In the case where Karmann felt the department chair was using her department chair position her to justify her bullying, Karmann observed that,

> It seemed she was using the annual evaluation process as an intimidation tool rather than as a development tool. I have had a couple of conversations where I've had to say "I'm going to look at you and say, that's not what I am looking for in an evaluation. When I read this sentence in her evaluation, it shows that you make no assumption that the faculty member can improve. That's not what I am looking for."

Karmann shared her sense that the intervention with the chair had little effect. "I'm afraid that she doesn't actually see what she's done, but her 3-year term as chair is up and the junior faculty member didn't make me aware of the situation until just before she was going to step down."

Karmann's priority was to get the bullying to stop. Although she was unsuccessful in persuading the department chair to change her behaviors, she believed—hoped—that the bullying would cease once the chair was no longer in a position of power. She had less hope for the serial bully she nicknamed The Yeller.'

The faculty member who was targeted by The Yeller filed a formal complainant through the college harassment process accusing The Yeller of creating a hostile environment for women. The committee investigated the accusations and found that there was "substantial reason to believe that he had done what he was accused of doing" and referred the case to Karmann, the provost, for action. Karmann described the process as follows:

> Then I [Karmann] meet with him. He has a chance to respond once more to those charges, but he responds to me and I get to question him and I determine that he had done what he is charged with doing. So I decided the most important thing was that he not be in the position to negatively impact the careers of those people who made the charge. And so my sanctions were that he could not participate in any search committees going forward and that he could not participate in any candidate review committees . . . he's just out of the process for all of those for the remainder of his career.

Yet, Karmann was convinced that this would have little effect on the bully's behavior. "What I hope will happen is that once he gets past his anger and utter defensiveness, he will realize that he is eligible for phased retirement and that he'll just retire."

Strategies, actions, and interventions. When dealing with faculty, the factor of tenure looms large. I asked Karmann to speak to the differences in the way that she

would handle a staff bully as contrasted to a tenured faculty bully. Dealing with staff "is so much easier" she replied.

> First of all, the staff would use [human resources] before coming to me. If it got to the point of Robert being involved, by then they would have had a performance improvement plan and consequences spelled out, all of that. I can't do that with faculty. You know sometimes people come in and say that this person is so bad we should move toward revocation of tenure. And I say, OK, let's think about that process. It goes to the faculty personnel committee. There's a whole process involved. There will undoubtedly be some improvement plan put in place and the person will behave better for quite a while based on that, but probably he can't behave well forever, so a year or so down the road there will be another explosion and he will come back and we will say we really meant it and so if it happens again, so then it goes 2 years. And I say this man's going to retire before that, so do we really want to go through that whole process which is very destructive to the whole campus community or do we just want to marginalize him and wait him out?

Policies. Although faculty governance documents are thorough and explicit when it comes to faculty authority over matters of academic policy and processes for promotion and tenure, there are no specific statements or policies for professional standards of collegiality at Adams College.

> I don't think in our lifetimes the institution of tenure is going away. Nor do I want it to. . . . But I think it is one of the challenges of that system that when this kind of generally egregious behavior comes along, our options for dealing with it

> are limited. And, this may be true in a lot of places, but I think it is particularly problematic here that this faculty has been known for decades as being sort of feisty and difficult. And I don't think anybody has ever tried to address it.

Thus, other than the formal harassment process, there are no specific processes for addressing the bullying behaviors, and no remedies or sanctions spelled out. In every case, the first priority is to create a safe environment and make the behavior cease. In most cases, Karmann looked for ways to marginalize the bully; where that was not possible, she found ways to diffuse the toxic atmosphere created by the bully. Whether she imposed sanctions on the bully or tried the softer approach of reasoning and reminding them of their better selves, she did not express confidence that she had been successful in persuading the bullies to accept responsibility and commit to change.

> What frustrates all of us in these jobs is the disproportionate time and energy that these folks take when so many of the people here are just extraordinary in all ways—teachers, colleagues, scholars, members of the community. But I think that the fact that nobody's done it [confronted the bullies] in however many years they have taught here is part of the reason we have the problem we have now.

Systemic changes. Because of her deep belief in the faculty of Adams College and her commitment to the students, Karmann was determined to change the campus environment that tolerated the abusive behavior of bullies.

> This year in response to these [issues], I've been bringing in a dispute resolution expert from out of town. She's been working with individual faculty and entire departments. In the instance of the woman who felt incredibly bullied by this senior colleague, I had decided it had gotten too far out of hand to try and put

> them in a room together even with the mediator and have a conversation, but I wanted this young woman to know that she was supported and maybe there were some strategies the consultant could help her with in terms of dealing with the situation. In other instances the consultant has sat with entire departments and worked through some difficult conversations with them. It has been enormously successful.

With Karmann's support, Carol, Director of Faculty Development, asked the president to host a speaker to address bullying behaviors and started a reading group to discuss the issues of incivility on campus. She also set up a series of 90-minute sessions for department chairs on identifying unacceptable behavior and having difficult conversations. In an effort to change the environment that would accept bullying behaviors Carol also made a point of having conversations with young department chairs who might be still on tenure track in an attempt to help them recognize appropriate professional behavior. Karmann made it a point to work closely with Carol in this outreach:

> I think it is part of our jobs, even if it gets to the point that it is uncomfortable. I have my eye on a couple of younger folks and mostly I've had Carol talking with them because it's less intimidating. But I see this [bullying] behavior and I say this person's headed in that person's direction and we don't need that role model. So, if you can talk to them and help guide it, fine; and if you can't, I'm going to step in and say you don't get to be a [jerk] just because you watch other people do it.

At the time of this study Carol believed that things were beginning to change, with the environment of tolerance for bullying slowly subsiding. She recounted that in a recent faculty meeting the president had called out the person who had been bullying the provost.

> It was a brilliant time to do it and a little uncomfortable for the people there, but I think the president was sending a message that this was no longer going to be tolerated. [Afterwards] everybody talked about it. Everybody was thrilled and felt relieved that someone has finally stood up and said, "This is not okay. This is not the kind of intellectual argument, reasoning behavior that is esteemed in the academy." I think people are finally fed up with this bully.

And Karmann believed that her actions would help to change the tide:

> I think I have allowed people to talk about it [bullying] in a way that they never would have with at least the last two leaders sitting in this office. And it took several years of me being here and developing trust before people would even talk to me about it. So I think, yes, I think the fact that they have gotten to know me, that they have some confidence and that I won't just shrug it off and say live with it. I know most of the processes are pretty quiet, but you can't [take these actions] and not have the rest of the campus know that is what you have done. And you can't have this mediator showing up and sitting with certain departments and not have people saying, "Yeah, we knew about that problem but we didn't think anybody would ever do anything about it."

Summary

Karmann is highly respected by her faculty, yet the inherent faculty wariness of administration and the history of a faculty socialized to avoid confrontation and to handle issues themselves often precludes her from getting involved until the situation is egregious. Her current working strategy was to do whatever could be done to marginalize the persistent bullies protected by tenure in order to minimize their negative impact, while working with others to change the environment that allowed the bullies to prosper. Triangulation confirmed that faculty have high regard for Karmann and trust her leadership. Her willingness to take on issues that have been left to fester for years will help others find their voices and little by little establish an environment intolerant of bullies.

Case 2: Barbara, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Barrymore College

Barrymore College: the context. Barrymore College is a private, coeducational comprehensive college located in the upper Midwest. This Catholic college was founded 100 years ago by an order of nuns one who continue to sponsor it today. The college enrolls approximately 4,000 students annually, with 2,100 undergraduates on the main campus. The remaining graduate and undergraduate students attend classes either online or at one of the four satellite locations. There are nearly 200 full-time faculty on the main campus, and about the same number of adjuncts teaching at the satellite locations.

The Faculty Handbook is the governing document for the faculty of Barrymore College. This document describes the faculty rights, roles, and responsibilities that define the relationship between the faculty and the institution. In addition to the handbook, Barrymore College has a published College Code of Conduct that applies to

faculty, staff, and students. Rooted in the values and mission of the founders, the Code calls all members of the college community to ethical and principled behavior in their work and in the interactions with other members of the community. Faculty are expected to sign a pledge each year signifying that they understand and will abide by the Code of Conduct. At the time of this writing, the Code had been recently revised to specifically include bullying as a prohibited behavior under its harassment and workplace violence policy.

The system of faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure follows the traditional process of peer review culminating in recommendations sent consecutively to the appropriate dean, the vice president for academic affairs, and the president. Faculty play a significant role in determining the tenure worthiness of faculty and work. They work collaboratively with administrators to ensure that all faculty hired, tenured, and promoted meet the high standards of Barrymore College.

Interviewing Barbara. Thanks to her good directions I found Barbara's office easily in the administration building, which appears to be the original building of the 100-year-old campus, built on the highest hills of the city. The corridors of the building are long and wide, filled with the familiar trappings and symbols of a college building: bulletin boards with announcements of upcoming events, available services, and general information; pictures of former and current leaders; offices and meeting rooms. As I walked down the hall, I felt like I could almost see the nuns in their habits, bustling the girls along to class, rosary beads clicking but soft-soled shoes making nary a sound. Barbara's office on the second floor of this majestic building sits in the middle of the floor in a suite she shares with the president. Their offices are located on either side of

the reception area, facilitating impromptu and informal interactions between them and their visitors.

When I arrived on a summer Monday morning, the president was standing in the doorway to Barbara's office chatting with her about their weekends. Once we had exchanged greetings and pleasantries, the president left and Barbara and I sat down at a small table to begin the interview. The cozy office is filled with books, pictures, and a few piles of files. Beth explained the files by observing that the quiet of the summer campus gives her the opportunity to catch up on review of faculty files, accreditation reports, and general correspondence.

As Vice President for Academic Affairs, Barbara had been the chief academic officer for Barrymore for 7 years. She began her career as a faculty member in a health-related field, and moved quickly up the ranks from department chair to dean at a similar institution where she served for 18 years. Barbara enjoys her work, particularly her interactions with young faculty. She makes it a priority to arrange dinners with each new faculty member during their 1st year on campus because she believes it gives her the opportunity not only to develop personal relationships with her faculty but also because it provides an opportunity to talk with faculty about the mission and values of Barrymore College. She actively engages in the biennial reviews throughout the tenure process as a means to guide the development of young faculty as scholars and teachers. Barbara is a confident leader who relies on her depth of experience as a dean and vice president when dealing with faculty personnel issues.

Addressing bad behavior. The academic administration of Barrymore College is organized in five schools, each under the leadership of a dean. Incidents of bullying rise

to the vice president's level when the deans or the human resources office refer a case to her.

> I usually become aware of them when the situation is frustrating enough that a dean can't handle it her- or himself. Or if a faculty member goes to HR (Human Resources) to explore a claim of harassment. They [HR] let me know that there is a situation and then we discuss whether they will handle it or whether it needs to be bumped to me. We kind of do it situation by situation. On the rare occasions when it comes to me directly, I deal with it within the academic hierarchy. Oftentimes when things come to me, they are not mine to deal with yet. My role is then to coach the folks in the chain to ask if the dean been involved in this. Has the department chair been involved with this? Has somebody told the faculty member that their behavior is unacceptable?

Barbara often found that the deans and department chairs preferred to send the issues to her rather than handle them directly. "I think Midwesterners in particular don't want to do that. Most department chairs and deans did not get into this business because they wanted to manage people."

Barbara related two incidents that involved the department chair, the dean, the HR office and herself. The first was a verbal altercation between a senior and a junior faculty member in a public area. The senior member was "aggressive, loud, demanding, blaming and demeaning" toward the junior member. Another faculty member, overhearing the hallway exchange in his office, notified the department chair and vice president by e-mail saying "there are issues between these two faculty that you should look into." He told the department chair that he preferred not to be involved. A day or so later the target met

with Peter, the department chair, to discuss the incident and her frustration with the faculty member who was bullying her. She told Peter that this recent incident "was not isolated, but just one more time in a long list [of interactions]." Although she felt intimidated and discouraged, she was reluctant to file a formal complaint for fear of retaliation. She worried that the bully, a senior, tenured member of the department would obstruct her progress through the tenure review process. "A fear not entirely unjustified," said the department chair. With his encouragement, she did consult with HR and spoke with the vice president, but never filed a formal complaint. However, at Barbara's urging, the department chair did meet with the bully who defended his behavior as a form of peer review, protected by his academic freedom. His position was that "academic freedom means colleagues can disagree with each other passionately. Thus, shouting and pounding fists does not constitute anything more than energetic disagreement." After consulting with Barbara, Peter reviewed the American Association of University Professors *1940 Statement of Academic Freedom* (2006) with the bully, pointing out the fallacy of his argument and required that the bully send a letter of apology to the junior faculty member. The junior faculty member, who had been considering leaving, decided to remain at the college; however, as she feared, the bully did attempt to block her tenure progress under the guise of protecting the tenure standards of the institution.

The second case involved a habitual bully who described himself as an East-coast guy who just says what he thinks and does not "bother with sugar-coating the truth, even if it hurts someone's feelings." Reports of highly charged verbal confrontations between him and others dated back at least 5 years at the time of this study. One faculty member purportedly left the institution because of his bullying. Most recently the department

chair, dean, HR and the vice president had been involved in addressing his belligerent and bullying behaviors toward another colleague in the department, who was, coincidentally, the faculty member described as the bully in the previously described case. In this case, there had been reported instances of loud altercations between the two in and out of their offices and at department meetings. The East-coast bully shared his opinions of his target widely, even when students were present. Finally, the target approached the department chair with a request to address the situation. When Peter's meeting with the bully was unsuccessful, he referred the situation to James, the school dean who then initiated conversations with both the bully and the target. The ultimate sanction was a formal letter, approved by the vice president, in the bully's file. The dean reported that things had been quiet the last several months, but that he expected this pattern of behavior to appear again at some point because the bully "does not understand how his behavior affects others and does not accept the findings."

Strategies, actions, and interventions. Barrymore College's Code of Conduct and workplace violence policy explicitly prohibits bullying but does not describe possible sanctions. Although the HR vice president who recently left the college was skilled at coaching deans and department chairs dealing with difficult situations, James observed that faculty would be reluctant to engage in a formal complaint process through HR. "That raises strong issues as far as the level of it [the complaint] and the implications as far as who's involved. Mostly, it [taking the complaint to HR] says we [faculty] can't resolve our issues internally and that has been unacceptable in our faculty culture. Maybe it will change as more people speak out."

Still, James could see advantages of engaging HR in an intervention process.

> We can ask that through the process the bully be asked to get some training in cultural competencies or go to some sort of anger management workshop or seek counseling—something that will address whatever the issue is. Seems if you can get them over that step, it can help. But it's hard to tell a faculty member to get counseling given the structure and independence of the faculty.

Joan, the associate director of human resources agreed. Although the policies are designed for the protection of all, she worried that "the faculty culture that prevails here keeps people from saying anything until it gets pretty bad." She also sees some of that changing as the newer, younger faculty might be beginning to view HR differently than their older colleagues and are "a little more willing" to try to look for solutions to a difficult situation. But the fear of retaliation lingers if the person is on a tenure track.

When looking for sanctions to address faculty incivility, bullying or general misbehavior, Barbara observed that

> All my problems are tenured! With some faculty who are adjunct or on term contracts you can say, 'this behavior changes or you are out of here,' but then for faculty who are tenured, it is just that you have no [leverage]; so, you think, do I want to use a carrot or a stick approach? Since you've got almost no sticks, you better get out the carrots.

I asked Barbara if she would consider a tenure dismissal for cause, in this case egregiously unprofessional conduct in relating to faculty colleagues and others. Although she believes she has the grounds for dismissal, she is ambivalent about taking that step.

> I would refer to the Code of Conduct . . . and we have some expectations of faculty within the faculty [handbook] that speak to consistency with our values.

> But that is what is so frustrating. If you have got somebody who you think is doing real harm to colleagues, coworkers, or students, are you going to go down that road of dismissal for cause, knowing how tough it will be to prove? Do you want to put the whole college through this?

Barbara's carrot versus stick approach. I believe that many bullies are insecure children and sometimes you can really change that bullying behavior by helping them to feel more secure, helping them see that they don't need to act this way in order to succeed at this institution.

Barbara preferred this approach in contrast to what she called a "harm reduction strategy" where the person might be removed from the classroom or from the department. In cases such as these, the faculty member retains her or his rank and tenure and continues to be on the payroll, but is freed from the responsibility to teach classes or participate in the department. Nonetheless, she would not shy away from facing the difficult issues. "I've learned to trust my instincts and honor the red flags when I see them," she said. She was willing to call recalcitrant bullies on the carpet and confront them directly with their behaviors and the effect their behavior has on colleagues. She has always been most impatient with those who bully students. She had not considered reductions in pay or withholding raises, but in an extreme case she prohibited a faculty member from teaching overload classes saying, "No more. You haven't earned the right to make extra money."

Long-term remedies. Barbara was pleased with the recent Code of Conduct and the growing respect for the HR office's procedures. She hoped that over time faculty would utilize the resources of this office early enough so as to avoid major problems.

She referred frequently to the mission and values of the college as the moral and ethical compass for all members of the Barrymore community and speaks of the need for its consistency with the institutional norms and climate.

James, dean of the school, pointed to more work to be done with the *Faculty Handbook* which was under revision at the time of this study. He hoped to influence the next iteration by challenging faculty to be more clear about behavioral norms as part of professional conduct. "We have to help faculty recognize that they are truly employees of the college and must be held to the same standards of other employees." This would suggest that tenure and academic freedom will not protect those who refuse to behave professionally or civilly.

During the previous academic year Barbara and the president had engaged the college leadership council in an extended discussion of dealing with challenging behavioral situations. The intent was to help campus leaders—vice presidents, deans, and department chairs—develop the baseline skills to help them tackle difficult conversations. The ultimate goal is to empower leaders to influence the professional environment of the institution.

Summary

Barbara is a seasoned administrator. Triangulation confirms that she is a no-nonsense leader who will support her deans and department chairs as they work through issues of bullying in the faculty. She becomes involved when they or HR ask her to do so. Her current strategy is to find ways to understand the bully and to offer her or him incentives for good behavior. When and if that is unsuccessful, she is not averse to

having the difficult, but necessary, conversation. However, in cases where the behavior persists in spite of sanctions, Barbara feels constrained by the existence of tenure.

Case 3: Rosemary, Provost, Cleary College

Cleary College: the context. Cleary College is a private, liberal arts college located in the upper Midwest. Cleary is a Catholic college, founded nearly a century ago. The values of the nuns who founded the college permeate the institution today: community, hospitality, service, and the search for wisdom through the liberal arts. The college enrolls nearly 4,000 students each year and employs 375 full-time faculty. The relationship between faculty and administration is based on the concept of shared governance and the lived institutional commitment to the values of respect for the individual and for the common good. Policies, processes, and practices attempt to "manifest those institutional values." The faculty handbook, developed as a collaborative effort between faculty and administration, reflects this dual commitment to the individual and the common good with carefully defined policies and procedures. As a result of the close collaboration with administration during the construction of the faculty handbook, the faculty has a strong sense of ownership over the document and trusts the provost to honor the conditions as stipulated. "The faculty handbook is their bible," Rosemary said, "I can't and won't do a thing without looking at the policies. All of the governance is in here."

Interviewing Rosemary. I arrived at Cleary College on a stiflingly hot Monday morning, a little harried by the fact that we were both on a tight timetable and I was arriving a few minutes late. The quiet and cool administration building provided some relief, but it was the enthusiastic welcome I received that settled my nerves. Without

even a hint of irritation with my tardiness, Rosemary offered me a cold drink and ushered me into her bright, pleasant office, ready to get down to the business of the interview. As we sat down at the small, round table I could imagine the myriad conversations that had taken place there. Rosemary has an earnest, generous disposition that bespeaks a consistently positive outlook. Her witty sense of humor is reflected in an energetic style of communication that is honest and direct without being confrontational. It is easy to imagine even the most difficult discussions with her being supportive and constructive.

Rosemary has spent her entire academic career at Cleary College. In fact, she is an alumna of Cleary where she studied music. After completing graduate degrees in music and higher education administration, she returned to Cleary as a faculty member in the music department where she taught for 15 years. She had been an administrator for the last 18 years, first as dean, then associate provost and has served as provost for 6 years. The fact that she has deep roots in the faculty of Cleary undoubtedly inspired trust in her leadership.

Rosemary was prepared for the interview. Knowing the topic, and anticipating the questions I might pose, she had the faculty handbook open on the table for easy reference and offered to make copies of any sections I might find useful. When I asked her to talk about her experiences with workplace bullying and how she responded to it, she pointed to the handbook.

> I have always used the handbook and that's what the faculty feel very comfortable using and it has really provided me with what I need as well. So, I don't feel like I am ever encumbered. So, if you look at the grounds for discipline and or dismissal, and usually I am dealing with the discipline issues [that] would fall

> under the category of what you just defined as bullying. You see that I am circling these things: "continuing neglect of the academic responsibilities in spite of all warnings, serious personal misconduct, deliberate and serious violation of the rights and freedom of other faculty members, serious failure to follow the canons and professional ethics of the discipline."

Experiences with faculty bullying. When I asked Rosemary to tell me about her experiences with faculty bullying, she recalled that when I initially contacted her with a request to participate in this research she had responded that she would like to help, but said, "To be honest, I can't think of any cases like this. Will we be helpful if we don't have cases?" But, after reading the Namie and Namie (2009) definition of workplace bullying, she noted that the definition would certainly apply to situations defined in the Cleary faculty handbook as "serious misconduct and serious violation of the rights and freedom of other faculty members." So, she invited me to come to Cleary College.

As we reviewed the handbook and talked about general application of the policies, Rosemary related two recent cases as examples of how she had dealt with situations involving faculty who were bullying their colleagues.

> I am dealing with something right now. I have a department . . . [where] a faculty member is disruptive and hurtful to junior faculty members. So I had the faculty member sit with me, the dean and the department chair and we pulled out the handbook and I said, "This is a question of serious personal misconduct when you do such and such and such and such at a department meeting and you refuse to speak with so and so." I also pointed out that the behavior is a serious failure to follow the canons and professional ethics of her discipline. So we talk about what

> it means to be in her department at Cleary. She had some defensive responses, but I kept going back to the policies and our institutional value of respect for individuals and the common good. And then what I did was have the dean write it up because orally she was not hearing that this is not acceptable, we see it as personal misconduct and you are deliberately and seriously violating the rights and freedom of other faculty members.

In another situation a department chair reported that a senior faculty member was creating a "harmful environment" for the department in general, and for one particular junior faculty member in particular; refusing to answer greetings, ignoring her questions, offering belittling and disparaging comments about her and her work in front of colleagues and even students. Recent department meetings had been tense and difficult, culminating in a meeting where the bully announced that he suffered from abuse, could not "take it anymore," and stormed out of the room leaving the rest of the department nervous and uncomfortable.

Rosemary met with the dean, the department chair, and the HR director to review the case and prepare the script for a meeting with the faculty member that uses the Faculty Handbook and commitment to institutional values to shape the meeting.

> Yes, it's scripted. I always start meetings with a discussion of our institutional values and the goals of a difficult meeting that we will try our best to be respectful to all parties. That doesn't mean just the faculty member who has an issue, but the provost, the academic dean, the HR director, that we are all facing an issue that is affecting our common good. And at the end of the meeting, I always go

> through a process to be sure everyone feels that they have been properly respected, and if they do not, the meeting is not adjourned.

The fact that this faculty member had self-identified as a victim of abuse and had claimed that identity as an excuse or cause of his behaviors ("I can't take it anymore") necessitated the active participation of the HR director. Rosemary directed the meeting as they had scripted with the dean and department chair, providing examples to help the faculty member understand the impact and consequences of his actions. The sanctions, including a mandate to "seek therapy to work through his abuse issues and develop workable boundaries for [his] professional behavior and relationships" were presented. A specific timeline was stipulated and possible consequences of any further violation were carefully explained. At the conclusion of the meeting the faculty member understood the seriousness of his situation and assented to the terms. When Rosemary asked if he had felt respected through the process, he told her he felt not only respected but liberated.

Policies drive process. I asked Rosemary to tell me about how it might be different with a more obstinate faculty member who would believe she had the protections of tenure and academic freedom. Rosemary responded, "From my perspective, no difference. We really expect our institutional values to be manifested by all." Rosemary did not hesitate for a moment when I asked her whether she felt hamstrung by the fact that that the faculty bully may have tenure. "No, not at all. I feel that it [faculty handbook] documents everything and there is no surprise for the tenured faculty member."

I was particularly interested in what sanctions might be available to the provost when dealing with tenured faculty. Rosemary referred again to the handbook.

> We start with the meeting and letter, oral and written, and then there is the progressive discipline which includes a second meeting and letter "warning that the faculty member's contract status is in jeopardy." The warning includes a deadline by which the behavior must be demonstrably changed. If the faculty member fails to correct the problem, then we move to "action short of dismissal." In such cases I can consider "suspension of all promotion and salary increments, suspension or withdrawal of faculty privileges" including access to travel or research funds, permission to teach overload, participation in promotion and tenure decisions, etcetera. If I feel that we still have a serious bullying issue, the action short of dismissal also allows me to impose a temporary suspension, with or without "total or partial discontinuance of salary and benefits." This sometimes is very helpful if here is a need for therapy.

Virginia, Director of Faculty Development, has chaired the faculty rank and tenure committee for several years and noted that these issues are sometimes effectively addressed through this venue before going to the provost's office.

> I would say for a tenure track person, the rank and tenure process includes professional identity as one of the categories we are reviewed under whether we are pre- or post-tenure. Our tenured faculty are reviewed every 5 years, so we do have the opportunity to respond to tenured colleagues, and in fact it's our obligation as tenured people who are required to review our colleagues' personal qualities, their professional identity.

The handbook. A review of the faculty handbook documents revealed that the policies of professional identity, and discipline or dismissal for cause, are clearly written

and understandable. They reflect a clear understanding of the limitations of academic freedom and tenure and faculty commitment to the mission and values of Cleary College.

> What is really amazing when I pull out this section of the handbook, and say, "Look at this, this is the handbook and the handbook has been created by the faculty and it's the provost's job to make sure that the handbook is being carried out." The person might say, "But I don't feel like I am violating another faculty member," and the chair who is at the table, and will say, "But you know you have to realize that it's your action that makes another individual feel like you are. Your actions are violating our college's value of service to the common good. Let's work together to find that delicate balance between respect for the individual [you] and respect for the common good of all."

Rosemary described the 6-year process for earning tenure, defined in such a way as to help new faculty understand the values of Cleary College and the faculty. Faculty development programs for 1st-year tenure track faculty would use the faculty handbook to introduce expected standards for teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Included in this was discussion of the professional identity and personal qualities required of tenured Cleary faculty, which included personal integrity, social maturity, and respect for colleagues. A comprehensive review of the faculty member's progress toward meeting these expectations was conducted during the 3rd year. The faculty member would present a full dossier first to the tenured members of the department for evaluation, who then formulated a recommendation to the Rank and Tenure Committee of the faculty, who then formulated a recommendation for the provost. "Rank and Tenure Committee is tough," said Rosemary.

> they expect community involvement and engagement, and if they hear about any type of bullying toward colleagues, strong language will be inserted in both the formative and summative recommendations to the provost.
>
> And we did have a case where a 3rd-year tenure track faculty member was treating adjuncts as second-class citizens and it was considered inconsistent with the professional identity expectations of a tenured faculty member. The R&T [Rank and Tenure] Committee made the clear statement that we do not have first- and second-class citizens here at the college, and we expect that behavior to change. Three years later, at his 6-year review, the candidate made a very clear case that he had done so. That is a success story.

Rosemary believed, and the directors of faculty development and human resources agreed, that the clear, strong policies and the faculty handbook statement about sanctions mute the protections of academic freedom and tenure. "And, we have not lost any lawsuits since I have been in this position," Rosemary asserted. Mary had a similar response to my query about tenure protections.

> This is not about dismissing individuals. It is about addressing the issue and whatever action needs to be taken in terms of the faculty member, the institution, the students, the colleagues who have been affected; we really do take that seriously. It is from a very broad perspective and in the interest of all parties.

Rosemary's style. Faculty member and Director of Faculty Development, Virginia, recalled a time when faculty viewed administration with suspicion and skepticism. She believed that Rosemary's careful adherence to the policies contribute to the current climate of trust because it demonstrated to the faculty that she, on behalf of

the administration, was serious about preserving the culture and the values of the institution. Virginia credited the current positive faculty-administration relationship to Rosemary's strong and "resilient" leadership.

Mary, director of HR, attributed the success of the disciplinary meetings to Rosemary's ethical leadership style. "She models the values of the institution whenever she manages a meeting, even when it is not about a specific employee issue." Mary asserted that this had contributed greatly to the open and trustful environment with the faculty. "She has worked to set that context as part of the culture here that we want to respect values, we want to deal with the issues, and not have the issues become hurtful for those involved." Virginia offered a similar opinion. "Things were different here when I joined the faculty 15 years ago. If we had statements of professional responsibility, we didn't enforce them. And we sure didn't look to administration to help us deal with difficult colleagues." Rosemary demurs, claiming the changing climate is the result of a collaborative process between administration and faculty and the new system of faculty governance.

Summary

Rosemary is an experienced administrator, deeply committed to the mission and values of Cleary College. Triangulation confirmed that she enjoys a positive relationship with her faculty, one based on trust and mutual respect and shared responsibility for the quality of the educational environment. Against this backdrop the faculty handbook stands as collaborative effort developed to ensure the values of respect for the individual and service to the common good. Although the term bullying does not appear in the faculty handbook, the explicitly stated grounds for discipline and expectations for

professional conduct make it clear that bullying behaviors have no place at Cleary College, regardless of a faculty member's rank or tenure status.

Case 4: Denise, Executive Vice President and Provost, Draper College

Draper College: the context. Founded in 1902, Draper is a private, coeducational, comprehensive college affiliated with the United Methodist Church and located in the Midwest. Draper enrolls approximately 5,200 students annually and has a full time faculty of 500. The college is situated in a major city, nestled in a residential neighborhood just a few miles from the city's downtown area thus combining the advantages of an urban setting with the ambience of a small town.

Faculty governance at Draper is centralized in an elected senate and codified in the faculty handbook. The policies and processes for appointment, promotion, and tenure are precisely laid out, as is the grievance process, which is tightly controlled by the Senate. The relationship between faculty and administration is mutually respectful, but guarded. A senior faculty member (Margaret) describes the relationship as "building toward trust." Prior to the current CAO's arrival, the relationship was characterized by Margaret, director of faculty development, as "moving from bad to horrendous" due to an inept provost who did not respect faculty and provided no direction or leadership. Difficult issues were ignored and tensions were unaddressed. In contrast, Margaret described Denise, the current CAO, as having "her act together" and building bridges through her collaborative leadership style and her "direct and dependable" approach to problem solving.

Interviewing Denise. Due to the difficult logistics of scheduling and travel, I was unable to meet with Denise in person. After a series of e-mails and one false start when I

failed to account for time zone differences, we finally connected by phone one afternoon in early summer. I have visited Draper on two occasions in the past, so have some sense of the campus environs. But, because I had never met Denise in person, I went to the Draper College website to find a picture of her to try to envision her as we talked. I discovered quickly that the voice on the phone matched the warm smile and open expression I saw in the picture. She greeted me as though we were meeting face-to–face, and as we exchanged pleasantries it became clear that she was pleased to be asked to participate in the study. She was eager to share her thoughts and ideas on the "fascinating" topic of faculty bullying because, "there are so many things that occur on a daily basis in our workplace that need to be addressed."

Denise had been executive vice president and provost of Draper College for 6 years. Her 25-year career at another institution began as a faculty member in psychology where she subsequently moved up the ranks from department chair to graduate dean to assistant and associate provost before leaving to join Draper. She claimed to enjoy the variety and fast pace of academic administration and presented herself as one who welcomes a challenge and does not shy away from difficult situations.

A CAO's thoughts on faculty culture. With the exception of an antiharassment policy in the handbook, there is no statement of professional conduct or responsibility. Denise noted that the college's "lawyer pointed out that harassment and hostile work environment are terms that are legally associated with sexual harassment," and not automatically applicable to other forms of unacceptable behavior. Nevertheless, complaints about bullying have been filed and considered under the antiharassment

policy. Denise commented on the "interesting dynamic" of having the grievance process controlled by the senate, and the ways she had tried to influence it.

> I will tell you that I had a little bit of discomfort with not having any input on some of these processes, so a few years I talked with the faculty Senate about identifying a group of faculty nominated by their deans who would be willing to serve as a pool for dispute management. So when the Senate had to deal with a grievance or some other dispute, they would draw from that pool and we together would agree on the pool. That wound up being a really good move. . . . The pool is such a strong pool because the deans know they want their very best, most ethical, most independent thinkers who don't have agendas, who will go in and do the right thing; people who are clearheaded, independent thinkers, who wouldn't allow the culture to dilute their peer review. And the Senate wants that too.

But the policy provided for little that could be done when a bully was tenured. "I think there is a culture here that the tenure piece trumps everything. It encourages some to engage in the battle, the intellectual battle that supports some of these dysfunctional dynamics in our workplace." She added that,

> the protection of tenure is taken so seriously by our faculty that even when the faculty acknowledge that one of their peers is behaving badly, once administration jumps in to censure that person, the faculty rally around them.
>
> I have tried to figure out why this is, and I think I have said this before, jokingly, but I think I am more serious about it. It's as if faculty are continuously in their lifetime and in their career defending their dissertations. They love the engagement of taking the contrary view or defending their view against contrary

> views, so they are so primed for the battle when we step in. And we as administrators are not able to share details, but the truth is, I don't think it matters. I really don't. The faculty who see such a clear division between themselves and administration are not going to hear it.

Dealing with bullies at Draper. When I asked Denise to talk about how she responded to situations of faculty bullying, she responded that there were two cases specifically that she wanted to highlight because they typified the complex cases that normally go to her. One case was a clear-cut example of faculty-to-faculty bullying. The second began as an investigation of a student complaint, but soon exposed a long, ingrained history of a faculty bully in the department. In the first case a junior faculty member was being bullied by two other members of the department who happened to be partners. The partners were marginalizing the third and involving students in undermining her position. When the dean tried to get the department chair to deal with the situation, things got worse.

> The worst part of this—and this is a sort of indirect bullying I think—was that the department chair, for reasons that are still not clear to me, was just unable or unwilling to exert her authority to get it under control. The department chair just abdicated. That is the only way to describe it and the situation escalated and the faculty member being targeted finally filed a grievance. It reached a point where, after the grievance was concluded, it was obvious that multiple people in that unit, including the chair, had participated in treating the grievant badly and the grievant was supported on most of her charges.

When the results of the grievance were presented to the provost she met with the dean and the department chair to discuss next steps. Denise expressed her disappointment with the department chair's lack of leadership and complicity in the bullying and informed her that she would assign someone from outside the department to co-chair that department for at least 1 year to provide an extra level of oversight. In addition, she "removed the [chair's] evaluative responsibility for all of the parties," and turned it over to the new co-chair. But it didn't end there.

> I wish I could tell you that we were successful. I think what happened was that the bullying went more underground. It was very, very difficult to get this couple out of their continuous undermining and harassing and humiliating of this other faculty member. So, the way it ended was the victim sought employment elsewhere and got a position elsewhere, so that kind of took care of that piece of it. [But] that did not absolve the chair, though, of the responsibility of managing the other two more effectively. Eventually what happened was that one of them also took employment elsewhere. So basically, we broke up the gang. Or, truthfully, the gang broke up themselves.

Denise went on to say that she did not feel good about the results for any of the people involved, including the department chair. "No amount of coaching . . . could get her to see how she was both an enabler and a participant. And that it was necessary for her to deal with it and lead her faculty."

Denise's second case began as a rather routine investigation of a student complaint alleging that he was being bullied by a faculty member. Very quickly the department chair investigating the situation became his [the faculty bully's] target.

> And this long-term, career-long icon in the unit started bullying the chair, making it very difficult for her to conduct her evaluation: basically being subtly insubordinate over stupid things like coming to agreement on a schedule, disrupting the business of the unit, and pulling other faculty members into the drama. So the informal investigation and management of the student complaint was not successful. We were unable to help the faculty member really recognize the impact he was having on students.

With the informal channel closed, the student complaint proceeded to the stage of a formal investigation "which then revealed a long-standing pattern of bullying behavior by this faculty member, that was basically not dealt with by prior deans; they just didn't deal with it."

I asked Denise if I was hearing frustration in her voice. "Frustration and anger," she replied. Learning that there was a history of this faculty member bullying colleagues and students, and knowing that previous deans and provosts had been unable or unwilling to do something about it was frustrating.

> The truth is, and I said this to the dean and the chair, had I known about this history before this guy came up for promotion to professor, he would have been turned down, I would not have promoted this man on the basis of inappropriate behavior toward students and colleagues.

And in spite of the fact that disciplinary action was invoked, nothing changed his attitude or behavior, even after several direct conversations with Denise that she characterized would be like being hit with "a two-by-four across the head" for anyone else.

> So this guy continues to needle his chair. He's on a very short leash with the dean and me. I don't think it is ever going to go away and we don't have a mechanism for dismissing faculty on the grounds of collegiality. So we are kind of stuck there. So our approach now is managing bad behavior, in as much as we can, and helping the chair learn not to take bait. This guy has had a lifetime of baiting people with this kind of stuff.

Margaret contended that there was nothing more Denise or anyone else could have done but try to find ways to work around him. He simply would not—or could not—accept that his behavior was inappropriate and damaging to others. "It is too late," she said, "his abuse of others has gone on too long without being challenged. The only way things will change is if he retires."

Sanctions and interventions. When I asked Denise to talk about possible sanctions available to the deans and provost, she described the extensive disciplinary action she had invoked with the long-term bully she had just described.

> Yes, we had a 1-year behavior improvement plan for him that included removing him [from a director position he held]. We had him go through coaching; he had readings that he had to talk over with the dean because his relationship with the dean was so volatile. We asked him to come up with his plan for how he was going to modify his classroom behavior, too. That wasn't terribly successful, but it did at least make him go through the motions thinking about alternatives. That wasn't terribly effective but we had a whole plan, a multistep plan which he just considered to be totally embarrassing and demeaning to him. But the truth is very

> few people had to know about most of the elements of it. It was really him running around telling everybody.

"So, what happened?" I asked Denise. "Did anything change?"

> After a year of reasonably good behavior . . . he was reinstated—on a short leash—in a director position, and as soon as that happened . . . he was all over campus telling people that he was vindicated; and the dean and I laughed about this and said, "no, you served your sentence and now you're being reintegrated back to society."

In the case of the dysfunctional department, Denise withheld authorization for new positions "until we saw evidence that any new faculty would be coming into a more productive and civil environment. A little bit of quid pro quo." In other cases she has required coaching, assigned outside faculty to direct departments and functional areas, and inserted a dean as referee between individuals.

Both Margaret and Denise talked the importance of systemic change, of finding ways to create a climate intolerant of bullying and general incivility. To that end the provost's office sponsored a day-long workshop on civility led by attorney Diane Millett. The workshop, entitled "Civil Space," was open to all faculty and staff of the university. Participants were asked to prepare for the session by reading *Choosing Civility: 25 Rules of Civil Conversation* by P. M. Forni, cofounder and director of the Civility Initiative at Johns Hopkins University. A significant number of faculty and staff, including a few who were "strongly encouraged," attended the workshop and follow-up discussion groups. The purpose of the workshop was to set the groundwork for a series of

discussions on social responsibility scheduled for the following academic year. "Of course most of the people who already know how to be civil come," said Denise, "

> but we wanted to send a strong message to the community that we are determined to create a climate of civility at Draper."

> But what I think happened was it did empower at least some of the converted to be more proactive as peers when this kind of thing is happening. I don't have evidence for that, but I think dealing with it systemically, and of course the speaker knew all of the details [of those strongly encouraged to attend as part of their behavior plans] without knowing the principals, so she was able to literally take slightly reworded statements that they had made and give them as examples of what she was trying to describe for us as problematic. So even if [the strongly encouraged] didn't hear it, others did. So that I think maybe, long-term, this was the most effective strategy that we took.

Denise has tried to affect the climate indirectly, as well, through modeling civil, respectful behaviors in her interactions with faculty governance processes and within her own staff. When I asked Margaret for examples, she said,

> Denise has created a group of deans who really work well together. As a team they have virtually eliminated territoriality. Denise fosters collegiality that is amazing. Her expectations are high, but she has left a lot of trust in them to address these issues and backs them up as they deal with the tough ones.

Whenever the faculty grievance panel met with her to present their findings and recommendations, Denise used the meeting as an opportunity to model respectful dialogue and to clarify mutual expectations for faculty civility.

> Almost all of the time I accept their recommendation or some very close approximation to it. But before I do that, I sit down with them and ask really tough questions of them and I try to get them to express where their areas of doubt are, what made them uncomfortable about a particular case, what do we need to do about the process to make it better. I also try to point out where I think the ambiguous parts are and where the choice points are and what the consequences are for one remedy over another just to kind of help educate them about the bigger political arena. Sometimes they come up with recommendations that sound really good but are not workable, so we have to puzzle through that a little bit. It's always a very frank conversation and I have to give the faculty credit who have participated on these, they have been very frank with me and I with them. I appreciate it. So there is a trust there that helps me learn and helps them see that the provost is serious about extinguishing all vestiges of a hostile environment.

Another macro, or systemic strategy, was in the area of faculty development programs. Under Denise's leadership a major goal of faculty development programs, particularly orientation programs for new faculty, was to "impart the positive institutional culture that we want to promote." Introductory and monthly workshops throughout the 1st year included strong messages about expectations for professional behavior in not only teaching and research, but also in relationships with colleagues and the college.

As we neared the end of our time I asked Denise if she had a philosophy of discipline that guided her when dealing with difficult faculty and what obstacles she faced that undermined efforts to create a climate free of bullying and other forms of incivility.

> I guess I believe everybody [should have] a chance to succeed and change their bad behavior. I would much rather have an individual participate in coaching, to learn more about where they went wrong, demonstrate they have learned it. Put them through those kinds of hoops rather than hit them with a host of negative sanctions that will only inspire more hostility and recalcitrant behavior and cause the faculty to rally more around the person. If you have a behavior improvement plan that involves coaching and reinforcement of positive behaviors, it's very hard for the faculty to say the provost shouldn't be trying to make this person better at what they do. I mean, that's an untenable position. So there would be some faculty who would do that, but others I think would be more likely to say we're all adults and we could all be better at what we do, so let's encourage so and so. That is what I would hope for.

Denise suggested that the biggest obstacle to changing the climate is the paradox of faculty reluctance to confront each other on bad behavior and their resentment of the administration stepping in when they will not deal with their peers. This reluctance could be rooted in a misunderstanding of the tenets of academic freedom and tenure, or simply from a lack of interpersonal skill as Margaret posits. Whatever the reason, Denise would like it to be different.

> What I would want would be for peers to take control of the situation and nip it in the bud as they see it happen. In other words, use the peer pressure that they have. Peers should be saying, so and so, this is just not acceptable. This is not what we stand for. This is what you are doing; this is what you need to do differently. Is there some way I can help you with this? So that it never gets to

> the level that I have to intervene and come down with the silver hammer so to speak.
>
> Peer review calls for holding peers accountable when they are bad actors. Most of the professional programs have strict codes of ethics that require them to hold peers accountable, but in most of the liberal arts area there is nothing like that. Just nothing like that. It is amazing how many will say "I am not tenured; please, I can't have this attributed to me." Well, no one person has power over their tenure, absolutely not. But the perception is that you [must] protect the academy, and if you don't you will be marginalized within the academy. That is what I would change in the culture. And a culture that is at times very dysfunctional.

Late in our conversation Denise revealed to me that as a junior faculty member at another institution she herself had been the victim of bullying on two different occasions. Although she considered herself a strong and assertive person even then, the prospect of a negative tenure review did give her pause. On the second occasion, when she did go to her dean for support and guidance, she was told to work it out herself. This may account for part of her determination to affect positive climate change. "I believe in the tenure system and academic freedom, but it should never be an excuse for mistreating or disrespecting anyone."

Summary

Denise is a strong, capable leader who is in the process of revitalizing a trust relationship between administration and faculty after a long period of discord. Triangulation confirmed that significant progress has occurred and that the expectation is

that it will continue to grow. In the absence of clear policy statements prohibiting bullying behavior or even outlining expected standards of conduct and collegiality regarding personal relationships between and among faculty members, Denise has chosen to devote her efforts to systemic change through education, and modeling, and to take a positive approach to individual situations with opportunities for coaching and skills development. Although the most egregious cases described for this study have not acquiesced to the interventions, there has been a systemic benefit in the message to others that this is behavior that will not be tolerated at Draper College.

Cross-Case Analysis

The purpose of this research was to understand and describe how academic administrators address instances of workplace bullying between faculty in light of the unique factors of employment in higher education: tenure, peer review, and academic freedom. The four CAOs interviewed for this study were all seasoned, experienced leaders who had served in various positions of academic leadership for 15-25 years. Their terms as CAOs in their current institutions ranged from 4 to 8 years. All had begun their careers as teaching faculty themselves, so they shared a natural understanding of the challenges and rewards of faculty life. Analyses—within case and cross case—revealed that in spite of different approaches, the CAOs shared a common goal: to eliminate bullying from their institutions by first, effectively dealing with individual faculty bullies, and second, establishing a climate of civility on their campuses.

Against that backdrop, three major themes emerged. The first two themes encompass the context within which the academic leaders (CAOs) were working: the climate or environment of the campuses, and the factors of employment unique to the

faculty position. The third theme describes the CAOs' leadership strategies in building a climate of trust while addressing bullying at the individual and systemic levels. The first theme provides insight into the impact of the faculty culture on institutional climate. The second illustrates how the challenges and benefits of tenure affected the CAOs' responses. The third theme focuses on the remedies and actions that CAOs have employed in their attempts to address bullying on their campuses. Various subthemes emerged as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3

Themes and Subthemes

Theme 1 Environment and Academic Culture/Climate	Theme 2 Unique Factors of Faculty Employment	Theme 3 Leader Strategies
▪ Campus climate ▪ Faculty culture	▪ Protections and entitlements ▪ Impact of Tenure	▪ Building trust ▪ Stopping bullies ▪ Creating a culture of civility

Theme 1: Environment and Academic Culture Climate

The job of the senior academic officer is often described as the most difficult position in the institution because the CAO is often caught between the faculty and the institution's administration. The CAO needs to manage the historic tension between the curricular authority of the faculty and the fiduciary responsibility of the Board and administration to operate the institution effectively and responsively. Positive collegiality and shared governance are often sacrificed to the pressure for nimble and timely responses to market demands. University administrators and corporate-type board members, familiar with hierarchical and authoritative leadership styles, have little understanding of, or patience for, the more deliberative, collaborative decision-making processes that characterizes faculty governance. Conversely, faculty have little patience for the board members and administrators who seem to dismiss the faculty's role in decisions affecting the educational mission of the institution. The successful CAO then, is one who is able to strike the balance that appreciates and represents the positions and opinions of both constituencies. Not an easy or enviable position to hold, especially if the CAO is to be effective in confronting issues that have potential legal and financial repercussions that require the approval and support of the administration and the Board.

The data analysis within cases and across cases revealed that the campus environment was a significant factor influencing how university leaders responded to incidents of workplace bullying involving faculty. The data suggest that the success of these leaders was closely related to the prevailing academic climate as determined by the quality of the relationships between faculty and administration and the quality of the faculty culture of collegiality.

The climate. All but one of the CAOs in this study came to their positions from outside their institutions and although the particulars varied, they all inherited chilly climates from their predecessors. Improving strained relations with the faculty became a high priority. Misunderstandings, unchecked assumptions, and turf battles had resulted in developing climates where faculty were either disengaged or actively resisting the administration. The CAOs spoke of encountering faculty who were suspicious of their motives and only grudgingly willing to participate in or support provost-driven initiatives. Reflecting on her first year as provost, one CAO spoke of needing "a hundred antennae going constantly" in an effort to understand and anticipate how faculty might react to any issue at hand.

The more positive the climate, the more effective the CAO could be, especially when intervening in situations involving faculty bullying. The first order of business for the CAOs was to establish climates that reflected commitment to the academic enterprise and respect for the faculty's role in supporting and advancing the institutional mission. Margaret described the climate at Draper College as "horrendous" before Denise arrived, but "building toward trust because of her leadership and willingness to take on the difficult issues both on behalf of the faculty and toward the faculty. At Adams College, "it took several years of me being here and developing trust in a variety of situations before people would even talk to me about it," said Karmann. "I think it's because they have gotten to know me that they have some confidence I will not shrug it off."

At the time of this study, all four campus climates could be described as being on a positive trajectory. Triangulation of data on each campus revealed that the CAOs had made significant progress in beginning to thaw the chilly climate of faculty wariness.

Relationship building seemed to be the key to changing the climate of distrust. Secondary participants and CAOs attributed the climate change to the leader's consistency and honesty. Carol, Adams College director of faculty development, said it best: The CAO's success is attributed to "just the plain hard work of walking the talk, showing up, and doing what she says she will do—fairly and honestly."

The culture. While definitely a part of the university, indeed at the heart of university, the faculty subculture remains distinct and separate from the rest of the university. Everything about faculty employment is unique and specifically delineated, from the definition of workload—courses versus time cards—to the definition of a year—academic versus fiscal calendars. Faculty do not see themselves as regular contract employees but as "professional scholars who are free to think critically and speak openly without fear of workplace censorship or retribution" (Washburn, 2011, p. 10). These differences, combined with the special considerations of attaining rank and tenure, contribute to the sense of privileged status associated with the faculty culture. As with any social culture, new members are expected to adopt and perpetuate the culture (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). New faculty adopt the values and practices of their colleagues in order to participate and belong in their culture.

This factor was a major subtheme across the cases. Faculty were often described as being culturally socialized to avoid confrontations and to protect one another from administrative interference. As one participant pointed out, "the faculty culture that prevails . . . keeps people from saying anything until it gets pretty bad." Even department chairs were reluctant to confront their colleagues. One CAO contrasted department chairs to [leaders in] a corporate setting, suggesting that "the people aspiring to climb the

corporate ladder get [understand] that it involves dealing with people's bad behavior, [but] academics don't expect that. So they can be hesitant to deal with it." In addition to the cultural taboo, or reluctance to confront misbehavior in the academy, junior faculty were reported to have expressed fears of retaliation, worried that speaking up would affect their tenure progress.

> It is amazing how many will say "I am not tenured, please; I can't have this attributed to me." But the perception is that you protect the academy, and if you do not, you will be marginalized within the academy.

The data revealed an interesting paradox within faculty culture on most of the campuses. Even in their reluctance to confront bad behavior, they wanted the behaviors to stop, and hoped someone (not they) would do something to make it happen. Yet, in spite of their unwillingness to confront peers and their desire to have the bullying cease, faculty were inclined to close ranks and resent administrative intervention, regardless of the behaviors.

> "We want to handle this internally; we don't want to take them out and embarrass our colleagues. We don't want to rat out our colleagues to the provost." And people think they ought to be able to handle it themselves, but they have no training or tools to deal with it.

As a result, many situations were left to fester and tensions persisted, albeit under the surface, with only the most conspicuous and unacceptable behaviors brought to the attention of the CAOs.

Theme 2: Unique Factors of Faculty Employment

The tenets of academic freedom, peer review, and tenure are rooted in the belief that the university must be a safe place where the scholar's search for truth is unimpeded by political, social, or religious forces. Tenure and academic freedom protect faculty members from arbitrary dismissal if their research or their positions on public issues are not in synch with the espoused beliefs of the institution. Faculty members who earn tenure have the reasonable expectation of continued employment with the institution for the remainder of their careers, in other words, a job for life. Earning tenure is a significant accomplishment in the faculty career path and tenure status is viewed as a credential of excellence and privilege.

Faculty who are hired on tenure-track lines are considered to be on probationary contracts for 6 years, during which time they are evaluated by their peers on the strength of their teaching, scholarship, and service to the university and community. Throughout this process, tenured members of the department are a major influence, formal and informal, in determining whether or not the person is ultimately granted tenure. The final review is conducted in the 6th year. If the decision is negative, the person is out of the university the following year. The stakes are indeed high and the tension is real.

Protections and entitlements. A significant subtheme that emerged was the importance of the tenure culture and the impact of the power differential between senior, tenured faculty, and junior, tenure-track faculty. Each CAO shared stories of senior faculty who claimed their rank and tenure status provided license to be rude, critical, or generally aggressive and difficult in their interactions with others, especially junior faculty. As for the junior faculty, their awareness of the power differential and the direct

impact which senior faculty could have on their tenure quests, often proved to be a major obstacle to bringing forward a complaint of bullying or harassment against a senior faculty member. Furthermore, two of the four institutions involved in this study had no policies prohibiting bullying behaviors.

> Not in the contract. In our faculty handbook there are some statements about reflecting well on the university. There are some statements in there about how they should treat students. And there is more guidance there than there is in terms of how they treat faculty or staff. . . . which is kind of interesting because there seems to be an underlying assumption that faculty will treat each other well and staff, too, which you wouldn't be doing this research if that were true.

As CAOs and participants discussed the tenure climate on their campuses, they spoke of the sense of entitlement and some faculty members' claims of immunity to systems of accountability outside the faculty systems of peer review. CAOs acknowledged the challenges of trying to dismiss, or even sanction, a tenured professor. Statements like "all of my problems are tenured" and "tenure trumps everything" reflected the CAO's hesitancy to engage in a dismissal process because it is understandably cumbersome and weighted to the advantage of the tenured professor.

"I think it is one of the challenges of the tenure system that when this kind of generally egregious behavior comes along, our options for dealing with it are limited," said one CAO. Even those willing to dismiss a tenured professor for cause acknowledged the consequences and agreed that dismissing a tenured professor would have significant repercussions beyond the people directly involved, possibly threatening the trust levels the CAOs were working to achieve.

Tenure. While the existence of tenure has many positive aspects for both the individual and for the university, it is also fertile ground for abuse and bullying. Although hard to get, tenure is even harder to lose. Tenured faculty can be dismissed only on grounds of gross incompetence, egregious misbehavior, or an institutional declaration of financial exigency. Such a strong system of protections and guarantees can easily lead to the assumption that "anything goes," that tenured faculty are free to do or say just about anything they want, to anyone, without fear of reprisal. Regardless of whether their contracts expressly prohibited bullying, all the CAOs agreed that the protections of academic freedom and tenure do not give license to bullies, and recalled instances of spirited conversations with faculty who were claiming academic freedom as an excuse for their behaviors.

As one secondary participant, quoted earlier in this study, spoke of the need to help "faculty recognize that they are truly employees of the college [are subject] to the same standards of other employees." If faculty were held to the same standards of other employees it would suggest that tenure and academic freedom will not protect those who refuse to behave professionally or civilly.

Theme 3: Leaders' Strategies

The third major theme to emerge from the analyses related to the CAO's approach to bringing about positive climate change within an environment intolerant of bullying behaviors. The within-case and cross-case analyses revealed that all four leaders shared the goals of finding ways to influence positive change in order to create a culture of civility and to stop harmful behaviors of individuals. In every case leaders spoke of efforts to heighten awareness and influence the campus climate while simultaneously

dealing with the individual bullies; and while their varied methods for reaching those goals reflected differing philosophies, three major subthemes emerged: building trust, while simultaneously stopping bullies and creating a culture of civility, with macro strategies focused on systemic change and individual-specific strategies focused on the bullies themselves. As one CAO put it, no matter what is done to bring about systemic change, "we still have to put them [bullies] in 'time out' as a signal to our colleagues that this is absolutely unacceptable behavior that we will no longer tolerate."

Building trust. As stated earlier, the data suggested that the success of these leaders was closely related to the dynamics of the particular faculty- administration relationships. Although the CAOs had all inherited negative situations, triangulation revealed that the CAOs had been effective in moving to a more positive situation. They all appeared to enjoy the confidence of their peers, colleagues, and their faculties; a status earned, not easily given. Data analysis and triangulation pointed to the CAOs' qualities of honesty and consistency and their skills in relationship building as significant factors in their success.

One thing that I observed in my meetings with CAOs and the participants from their campuses was the fact that they worked with what was available to them. Three of the four relied on the institution's mission and vision as guideposts for the change they were trying to create. Calling faculty to the core values of the institution proved to be an effective strategy when dealing with difficult issues and individuals. One CAO relied on the mission and values in every interaction by asking faculty if what they were doing was in service to the values of respect for the individual and for the common good of the institution. Another asked people to think about the Christian mission of the university in

relation to the topic at hand. In every case, CAOs viewed themselves and faculty as keepers of the mission and used that view as the basis for building positive relationships with faculty.

Stopping bullies. The participants talked about their responsibility as leaders of the academic program for creating a safe place for everyone, both for faculty who were targets of bullies and those affected by it. Although all CAOs were committed to stopping bullying, their strategies varied in relation to established policies of their universities, as well as their own philosophies of discipline.

Probably the biggest challenges for CAOs were those cases that had been left to fester through the years. Every CAO described at least one veteran bully from the faculty, someone identified by others as "difficult, boorish, or rude or mean." In all cases, the faculty bully was a veteran member of the faculty, having worked at the institution for many years. In most cases the bully had gone unchallenged by peers and excused as "just a disagreeable curmudgeon."

The data from CAO interviews and secondary triangulation confirmed that CAOs were unwilling to allow the bullying to continue unchecked. Their approaches to bully situations varied according to the tools (policies) available to them and their own philosophy of discipline. One CAO described her theory this way:

> If you are going to intervene you need to operate on some theories about why this [bullying] happens. I have this theory for behavior problems in the workplace and I think most of them stem from people who are not emotionally healthy. I believe that many bullies are insecure children and sometimes you can really change the

> bullying behavior by helping them to feel more secure, helping them see that they don't need to act this way to succeed at the institution.

A second CAO had a similar philosophy:

> I guess I believe everybody has a chance to succeed and change their bad behavior. I would much rather have an individual participate in coaching, to learn more about where they went wrong, demonstrate they have learned it. Put them through those kinds of hoops rather than hit them with [negative sanctions] because for one thing that remedy is only going to inspire more hostility and recalcitrant behavior.

And one CAO spoke of her carrot and stick philosophy of dealing with tenured bullies:

> With some people you can say, this behavior changes or you are out of here, and then for faculty who are tenured . . . you say "do I want to use a carrot approach or a stick approach?" but you've got almost no sticks. So you had better get out the carrots. That is what is so frustrating, and if you have got somebody who you think is really doing harm to students or colleagues, then are you going to go down the route of tenure dismissal for cause or are you just going to look for ways to [minimize] the harm?

I included these quotes to demonstrate the range of CAOs' thoughtful responses and the commonalities among the approaches they described. While each approached it a bit differently, none were avoiding the issues, and each was working with the tools and systems available to them.

Creating a climate of civility. The data showed that each of the CAOs was committed to finding ways to stop the bullying and minimize the harm being done. But

all acknowledged that case-by-case remedies would not effectively eliminate bullying from the environment. A systemic approach would be required. The approaches to changing the culture that allowed bullying to persist were similar across the cases. Outside consultants were brought in to work with conflict resolution in specific cases, other consultants were invited to campus as speakers and workshop presenters, new faculty orientation programs were redesigned to include expectations for professional and collegial behavior. In at least two cases, work was underway to include professional behavior as part of the annual assessment process.

The cross-case analysis revealed that all CAOs recognized the importance of modeling and messaging as essential components of creating a climate of civility. The message that incivility and bullying should not be tolerated came out clearly, as faculty observed bullies being held accountable:

Each CAO and most of the secondary participants spoke of the importance of consistently modeling respect and civility in all interactions with colleagues. Demonstrating that "colleagues and scholars can disagree passionately about opinions and ideas without making it personal," and showing that "recognition for excellence is not a zero-sum game," are ways of modeling a culture of civility. At the same time, CAOs expected that the faculty would take responsibility for honest peer review that would hold their colleagues accountable, not only for good scholarship and teaching, but also for good behavior.

Summary

The participants in this study were all experienced, seasoned administrators, each of whom had been in senior academic leadership positions for several years in one or

more institutions. The leaders understood that establishing a reciprocal climate of trust and accountability was key to their ability to hold faculty to high standards of acceptable behavior and deal effectively with issues undermining their goals of creating a healthy environment for all. The additional factors affecting the faculty culture, especially tenure status and peer review, added complexity to the challenges facing CAOs.

In some ways every bullying situation—and the resulting CAO response—is as unique as the individuals involved. But in all situations the pattern of abuse is similar: persistent mistreatment including humiliating, intimidating, and degrading comments or actions aimed at demeaning or obstructing the target's work. Most often there is some sort of power differential involved, such as rank or tenure, and the tools available for sanction or redress depend upon the institution. The tools available to CAOs in this study ranged from explicitly stated expectations for professional conduct with defined policies and processes, to vaguely worded statements referring to "conduct befitting the academy," with no corresponding policies or processes. In the latter cases, the only formal recourse was through existing grievance or harassment processes.

The CAOs agreed that tenure and academic freedom are not protections for the unacceptable behavior of bullies, but in most cases (three of the four CAOs); tenure status impeded or at least affected their approach to corrective action. For at least two of the CAOs, the hassle and repercussions of a tenure termination process outweighed the advantages of dismissal. In those cases the CAOs imposed sanctions designed to minimize or isolate the bully's power and influence, or decided to "wait it out" and focus instead on shielding the bully's target from further abuse. The data from CAO interviews and secondary triangulation conveyed a strong message that in spite of the obstacles, the

CAOs were in search of ways to eliminate bullying from their campuses and were committed to nurturing a culture of civility where faculty and students could thrive in a climate that would support the core mission of the university.

The purpose of interpretive research is to "describe, understand, [and] interpret" (Merriam, 2009, p.11). In this chapter I have first presented four individual cases, placing emphasis on describing and understanding the experiences of CAOs dealing with faculty bullying in their institutions. In the cross-case analysis I offered three major themes, or categories of themes, describing the common issues affecting the CAO's response to workplace bullying. The discussion section of Chapter 5 provides my own interpretation, of the themes identified in the cross-case analysis.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

My interest in studying how academic leaders respond to cases of bullying between faculty stems from my own experience as a CAO and my interest in the unique characteristics of the social contract (Hamilton, 2005) between faculty and the university. I have been interested in the topic of workplace bullying, specifically as it relates to faculty for several years as a result of conversations with faculty and with my CAO colleagues have struggled with the issues surrounding cases of faculty-to-faculty bullying. These conversations seldom produced anything more than expressions of frustration and concluded with promises to share ideas if we had any. Intrigued by these conversations and the questions they raised about bullying, I decided to pursue the interest through my doctoral dissertation in Organization Development (OD). It is my hope that other CAOs—and OD consultants—will benefit from this research and the findings.

The purpose of this research study was to understand and describe how university leaders respond to bullying behaviors in faculty. Through the study of college and university senior academic administrators (CAOs), I wanted to understand and describe how CAOs address instances of workplace bullying between faculty in light of the unique factors of employment—tenure, peer review, and academic freedom—in higher education.

This final chapter will compare the most significant findings with the related literature, further elucidate the findings, discuss limitations of the study, pose recommendations for future research, and consider implications for OD practitioners.

Discussion of Findings

The four CAOs in this study were experienced, effective academic administrators who demonstrated a deep understanding and appreciation of the unique aspects of faculty employment, especially in relation to the tenets of tenure and academic freedom. They were uniformly committed not only to nurturing a climate of trust that would support positive intervention in individual situations, but also to facilitating the systemic change necessary to an environment intolerant of bullying.

My findings, presented in Chapter 4, cross three major themes: environment, unique factors of faculty employment, and leader strategies. I believe the richest topics for discussion in this final chapter fall into two categories: first, the impact of tenure with its unique protections and entitlements; and second, the responsibility of leaders to develop and lead strategies that address both the individual and systemic issues of workplace bullying.

The impact of tenure with its protections and entitlements. The findings of this study echoed the findings of Keashly and Neuman (2010) that faculty instances of workplace bullying are more likely to occur between colleagues rather than between faculty and administrators. This is easy to understand in light of the tenets of academic freedom and peer review. Designed to protect the faculty's individual and collective autonomy, these principles ensure faculty of substantial influence over the processes for appointment, promotion and tenure of their peers (McKay, 2008).

I found the pattern of faculty inclined to avoid confrontation and resist administrative intervention to be consistent with the findings of researchers Keashley and Newman (2010). As with any social culture, new members are expected to adopt and

perpetuate the culture. CAOs and the secondary participants noted that the desire to be accepted in faculty culture and the fear of reprisal made junior faculty reluctant to speak up against negative behavior, even if justified in doing so. This pattern is consistent with the literature regarding cultural socialization in organizations (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

There is little motivation for faculty to confront bad actors, thus actually allowing situations to escalate rather than be resolved. Not only is there a strong desire to fit into the culture, but the fear of retaliation and marginalization was a consistent theme in this study, discussed often in the bullying literature (Fogg, 2008; Keashley & Newman, 2010; Matthiesen, Bjorkelo, & Burke, 2011; Namie & Namie, 2009; O'Meara, 2004; Raineri, Frear, & Edmonds, 2011; Twale & DeLuca, 2008).

The CAOs in this study and I are in agreement that academic freedom and tenure are cornerstones of American higher education. These protections are assurances of the quality of higher education (Birnbaum, 1998; Burgan, 2008; Ginsberg, 2011; Hamilton, 2008; Johnston, Schimmel, & O'Hara, 2011; Theilen, 2004; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). At the same time, we recognize the unintended consequences of the system, especially when it is assumed to be an entitlement that protects faculty from being held accountable for negative behaviors. The strength of the system is also its weakness: tenured faculty have the power, real or imagined, to affect the futures of those faculty on the probationary tenure track. This inherent power imbalance is the fertile ground found on college campuses, including those presented in this study.

When analyzing my findings both within each case and across the cases, I noticed that there was a range of responses and approaches among the CAOs to cases of faculty

bullying. While they all displayed a thorough understanding of the true limits of tenure and academic freedom, all acknowledged that tenure made the cases more difficult to address. However, one stated unequivocally that tenure would not deter her from dismissing a faculty member for egregious behavior toward another faculty member. She believed that having clearly stated codes of conduct, investigation processes, and disciplinary sanctions was the key to establishing trust that all matters will be dealt with fairly. Returning to the literature, I discovered this was a consistent theme in articles on managing workplace bullying, where the authors argued that having policies and procedures in place not only assures targets that their complaints will be heard fairly but also assures others in the workplace that bullying will not be tolerated (Hoel & Einarsen, 2011; Rayner & Lewis, 2011; Salin, 2003).

Leaders address individual and systemic issues. The findings of this study support claims in the workplace-bullying literature that strongly suggest that an organization's culture and climate determine the viability of a bully culture. In other words, bullies will act as bullies because the organization allows it. A faculty culture that is reluctant to confront peers and is resistant to administrative interference perpetuates the hostile climate by tolerating bullying behaviors or explaining them away with, "that's just John, he's such a curmudgeon, don't take it personally." There is a generative factor in this. Ignoring these situations sends a message to junior faculty that there is an institutional tolerance for bullies. Furthermore, the climate will become increasingly toxic and hostile (Fogg, 2008; Rayner, 1998; Rayner & Lewis, 2011; Salin, 2003; Salin & Hoel, 2011; Twale & DeLuca, 2008).

The campus climate and faculty culture have a powerful effect on the CAO's ability to lead change. Understanding the faculty culture is an important first step to engaging faculty in creating a positive learning and working climate. On campuses where the relationship has been fractured, the onus is on the CAO to create that change before much else can be accomplished. Wise CAOs understand that this will only happen through relationship building and modeling consistency and fairness for all to see. Active engagement and appropriate consultation with the governance process and faculty leaders demonstrates a desire to establish a mutually respectful and supportive relationship between administrator and faculty (Gunsalus, 2006).

A major theme of this study's findings is that in order to create a climate intolerant of bullying, the leaders need to address both the individual bully's behavior and the systemic issues in the environment that allow the abuse to continue (Vartia & Leka, 2011). Leaders who avoid confronting the bullies perpetuate the problem (Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2010; Keashley & Neuman, 2010). The CAOs profiled in this study were all committed to finding ways to stop the negative behaviors of individuals and finding ways to support their target. The studies, within and cross-case analyses, revealed a variety of interventions that ranged from direct conversation to sanctions including loss of faculty privileges, to probationary timelines, and to processes leading to termination of employment. At the same time, the CAOs were aware that systemic strategies were also necessary.

A significant finding of this study was that clearly articulated policies and processes provide a solid base for the CAO for both responding to incidents of faculty bullying and for creating a climate of civility and respect. In revisiting the literature, I

discovered a number of studies with similar findings and recommendations for strong policies prohibiting bullying (Ferris, 2009; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2010; Liefooghe, & Davey, 2001; MacIntosh, 2006; Namie & Namie, 2009; Raineri et al., 2011).

I found it interesting that the systemic approaches employed by CAOs in this study are similar to those described by Zapf and Einarsen (2001). Their simple four-step model outlining steps employers could take in making systemic changes included (a.) creating a values-driven policy, (b.) developing "credible" procedures for investigations and sanctions, (c.) crafting "restorative interventions" that would include coaching of the bad actor and counseling for the target, and (d.) training and development for supervisors and for the community. While only one of the four institutions had a complete program mirroring the Zapf-Einarsen model, each had portions. All had embarked on development projects involving outside speakers and consultants, and each had employed their own style in creating "restorative interventions."

A Deeper Analysis

As I reviewed and reconsidered the themes and subthemes that were presented in Chapter 4 and examined in relation to the literature in this chapter, I concluded that while the three themes encompass the results of the cross-case analysis of data, the reader may conclude that these are seemingly generic categories— environment, unique factors of faculty employment, and leader strategies—call for deeper analysis and interpretation. The following interpretation of the data presents a level of nuance and sub-subthemes that deepen this discussion of workplace bullying among faculty.

Theme 1: Environment and Academic Culture (and Hidden Secrets).

Understanding and assessing environment as it relates to culture and climate is basic to any intervention strategy in any organization. Understanding that the academic culture as characterized by peer review, academic freedom and tenure, is a separate and distinct culture within the university, is essential for dealing with faculty bullying in any institution of higher education. Regardless of the defensible rationale for the faculty's social contract of peer reveiw (Hamilton, 2008), the closed nature of the culture--faculty are actively involved in preserving the existing culture through the recruitment and appointment of new faculty and for decisions regarding the rank and tenure of their colleagues—enables abuse and discourages confrontation. While there is an underlying assumption that peers will treat each other respectfully and hold one another accountable, the reality, the hidden secret, is that faculty are socialized to avoid confrontation and to actively discourage any outside involvement or intervention from administrators even in situations where someone in being treated badly. Those faculty who do step out risk being ostracized or penalized by their peers and junior faculty fear retaliation that could jeopardize their futures. Department chairs, who are usually elected for three year terms, often lack the necessary skills or motivation to deal effectively with faculty who are misbehaving. Most chairs do not view themselves as supervisors; rather, they see themselves as keepers of the bothersome but necessary administrative functions of the department. Furthermore, they are fully aware that they will return to the ranks of the faculty when their terms end. Thus, situations that should be addressed are allowed to continue, often with destructive results.

Theme 2: Unique Factors of Employment (or Two Questions). The special conditions of the faculty contract, the protections of tenure, and the privileges of rank are discussed at length in Chapter 4. In light of that discussion, there are two questions CAOs and OD practitioners must ask: First, is academic freedom a license for incivility? Second, is tenure the ultimate trump card? The answers to both of these questions reflect the tools and remedies available to the CAO.

Academic freedom should not provide cover for bad behavior. The tenets of academic freedom are intended to protect the faculty member who proposes unpopular opinions and ideas in their teaching and scholarly research. Scholars are trained to challenge and question one another in their pursuit of knowledge and truth. But where is the line drawn? The senior faculty member dispensing disparaging critiques of a junior faculty member's work may claim it is his responsibility to be highly critical in order to insure a high-quality body of work, while the junior faculty member may experience the critique as demeaning and abusive. Absent solid policies and procedures with clear statements of expected professional behavior, the CAO has few options.

If tenure is the ultimate trump card, under what circumstances would the CAO be supported by the administration and Board if she were to initiate dismissal proceedings? And, what price would she pay in relation to the faculty? The hierarchy of rank and privilege creates a power imbalance that must be acknowledged. Junior faculty are reluctant to challenge senior faculty and department chairs would rather not challenge the status quo. Again, absent solid policies and procedures with clear statements of expected professional behavior, the CAO has few options.

Theme 3: Leader Strategies (Individual and Systemic). This theme encompasses the micro and macro strategies for creating a climate and culture of civility. The data reflected in the "stopping bullies" subtheme represent the CAO's best thinking in terms of the options available and her approach to discipline. Essentially the tactics the CAOs employed when dealing with the individual bullies amount to a set of harm reduction strategies that may isolate or marginalize the bully, and may even provide some relief for the person being bullied, but they will do little to improve the institutional climate or academic culture. In fact, if these strategies do not include the possibility of dismissal for cause, the unintended message could be that bullies are indeed protected by rank and tenure.

Creating a climate that is intolerant of bullying and incivility requires systemic interventions. The first requirement is building a climate of trust. CAOs who strive to walk the talk, to establish boundaries and confront bullies, to model respectful behavior themselves and mentor deans and department chairs to do likewise, send strong signals to the academic community that there is support for those who wish to speak up and for those who seek to build a more open climate of trust between faculty and administration.

Creating a culture of civility requires genuine, honest peer review. It requires a commitment to the institutional mission and values manifested in codes of conduct and professional responsibility. In many cases faculty resist these code; not because they do not want to be civil, but because they object to codified requirements for personal behavior, fearing that their academic freedom may be compromised. The CAO who can address these fears, and engage the faculty and administration through a shared process of

developing meaningful and respectful policies and consequences, will have established the foundation for systemic change.

Looking again at the findings and the discussions above, I see that everything in the findings distills to these five main points: (a) that the tenure process provides fertile ground for bullies; and (b) that the academic protection of tenure and academic freedom, does influence the administrative response to faculty bullying; but (c) that clear policies and processes developed through a faculty-administration collaborative process can provide an effective means for addressing cases of bullying; (d) that faculty culture and climate have a significant effect on the CAO's ability to lead change; and (e) that ultimately the changes must be systemic in order to eliminate tolerance of bullying from the culture.

When the focus of a study is to determine how leaders deal with negative incidents and systems, it is easy to lose sight of the whole picture. I am reminded of how one CAO described it:

> What frustrates all of us in these jobs is the disproportionate time and energy that these folks take when so many of the people here are just extraordinary in all ways—teachers, colleagues, scholars, members of the community. Everything about them—would give their lives for these students, and so it's frustrating just to spend that much time and psychic energy on just these few problems. But I think that the fact that nobody's done it in however many years they have taught here is part of the reason we have the problem we have now.

This may be the best argument of all for working to achieve systemic change.

Limitations and Delimitations

Because this was an interpretive study, the findings of this collective case study lend themselves to what Patton (2002) described as extrapolation, "modest speculations on the likely applicability of findings to other situations under similar, but not identical, conditions" (p. 584). Although the findings of the study cannot be applied to all higher education institutions, the themes identified in cross-case analysis may provide useful insights to other academic leaders facing similar issues.

The scope of the study was limited, in that participants of the study were all women CAOs, although it was not planned to be so, and all were working at private colleges or universities in the upper Midwest. Although the findings were based on primarily on participant interviews, I attempted to triangulate their perspectives with secondary participant interviews and review of pertinent documents and the institutional websites.

The delimitations of this study relate to the small size of the sample (four CAOs), and the moderate size of their faculties (170-400). In spite of the similarities, it is possible that another group with similar characteristics would generate different findings. Furthermore, the study was limited to private institutions, primarily because I wanted to avoid including CAOs who might be limited by collective bargaining agreements. It is highly likely that these findings would be somewhat different in such cases.

In the end, the "applicability . . . is determined by the practitioner" (Merriam, 2009, p. 226). It is the responsibility of the readers to decide if there is anything of note that applies to their particular situations.

Suggestions for Future Research

Additional research is needed in regard to institutional action plans to eliminate bullying from the environment. Since this study was limited in scope by the number of cases and the type of institutions represented, it seems evident that the topic would benefit by replicating this case study design in larger public institutions and in different areas of the country. Such studies would be enriched by attention to diversity in selection of the CAO participants.

In this study, the four CAOs were generally regarded as strong leaders who were effectively using whatever tools were available to them to confront and eliminate bullying on their campuses. What made that so? Would this be related to their leadership styles or to the culture and climate of their institutions? Are there gender implications? Further study of the leadership skills and resilience of CAOs dealing with difficult situations, particularly bullying, would be valuable.

It would be interesting to conduct a grounded theory study in order to develop a theory of institutional responses to bullying. One could go further and test the obtained theory through a positivistic case study methodology. Finally, mixed-method studies, combining surveys and qualitative case studies focusing on the strategies or action plans that institutions have employed, would provide a broader picture of the remedies available to academic leaders.

Implications for Organization Development Practitioners

Over the last decade, the topic of workplace bullying has received increasing attention in the research literature as well as the popular press. The wider-spread negative effect such behaviors have, not only on the target but also on others in the

workplace, cannot be ignored. The extra complexity of the protections of tenure and academic freedom adds to the urgent need to study this phenomenon in the context of higher education in order to understand and to devise action plans for eliminating bullying from academe. Understanding the culture of higher education and the unique conditions of employment that faculty enjoy will be critical to the success of any OD intervention. This study shines a light on issues the OD professional may wish to consider when working with higher education organizations. OD professionals would provide valuable contributions to higher education in the following areas:

1. Helping the academic leaders—CAOs, deans, department chairs, and program directors—develop effective leadership and communication skills, especially in the areas of direct feedback and supervising peers.
2. Helping institutions communicate the importance of civility and the toxicity of allowing bad behaviors to go unchallenged.
3. Helping organizations assess the current climate in order to identify the policies and practices needed to promote and sustain a healthy work environment.
4. Helping organizations develop micro- and macro action plans for systemic change that are congruent with the institutional mission.
5. Helping organizational leaders develop plans and policies and processes for dealing with bullying behaviors.
6. Helping academic professional organizations develop leadership training opportunities for those aspiring to academic leadership roles.

Personal Reflections

I have worked in higher education for my entire career and almost the entire time has been in one institution, where I have been in senior leadership for more than 20 years, and currently hold the CAO position. My situation is unusual in that my career path has not been through the ranks of the faculty but through the administrative fields of student affairs and enrollment management. In spite of the fact these senior positions have all been in the same institution, the faculty culture and the principles around tenure, peer review, and academic freedom were new territory for me with a steep learning curve.

It was during the time of my transition to the CAO position that I entered the doctoral program in OD. From the beginning of the program I found opportunities to apply my learnings from the program to my work with faculty, and to my academic leadership position. As I wrestled with thorny issues of personnel problems within an institution undergoing massive change, I had real opportunities to apply the theory-to-practice models presented in the classroom.

This was the backdrop upon which I designed my dissertation. Having observed instances of faculty bullying and having participated in many conversations with CAO colleagues across the country, I knew that I wanted to understand this phenomenon more fully in order to find ways to combat its devastating impact. The enthusiastic reactions of my colleagues whenever I spoke about the topic told me that it was a current and relevant issue.

Higher education is a fascinating and complex enterprise made up of many important parts, but the one part that is essential to the university's survival is the faculty. Without faculty there is no university. Without faculty who are free to question and

conduct research in the search for new knowledge and truth, there is no true university. I believe this, and I believe that tenure protects these endeavors. At the same time, one must be aware that the system can also protect those who should not be immune to the expectations of civil and respectful behaviors. Ultimately, this research helped me understand that there are ways to address bad behavior without eliminating the tenure system.

REFERENCES

Adams, A. (1994, May 24). [Text of speech given at a conference sponsored by the British Trade Union Manufacturing, Science and Finance]. Retrieved from www.workplacebullying.org/tag/andrea-adams/

Adams, H. (1988). *The academic tribes* (2nd ed.). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

American Association of University Professors. (2006). *Policy documents & reports.* Washington DC: Author.

Birnbaum, R. (1998). *How colleges work.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Braithwaite, R. (2001). *Managing aggression.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bullying Statistics. (n.d.) Bullying and suicide. Retrieved from http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/bullying-and-suicide.html

Burgan, M. (2008). Save tenure now. *Academe, 94*(5), 31-33.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* London, England: Sage.

Duffy, M., (2009). Preventing workplace mobbing and bullying with effective organizational consultation, policies, and legislation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 242 – 262.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 3-39). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Ferris, P. (2009). The role of the consulting psychologist in the prevention, detection, and correction of bullying and mobbing in the workplace. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *61*(3), 169-189. doi: 10.1037/a0016783

Fogg, P. (2008, September 12). Academic bullies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com

Foss, S. K., & Waters, W. (2007). *Destination dissertation*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.

Georgakopoulos, A., Wilkin, L., & Kent, B. (2011). Workplace bullying: A complex problem in contemporary organizations. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(3).

Ginsberg, B. (2011). *The fall of the faculty and rise of the all-administrative university*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gunsalus, C. K. (2006). *The college administrator's survival guide.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hamilton, N. W. (2008). Faculty professionalism: An opportunity for Catholic higher education to vitalize the academic profession's social contract. *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education, 25*, 177-198. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1334390

Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The relative impact of workplace bullying as a social stressor at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology,51*(5), 426-423. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2010.00813.x

Hoel, H., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Investigating complaints of bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 203-218). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Hoel, H., Glaso, L., Hetland, J., Cooper, C. L., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Leadership styles as predictors of self-reported and observed workplace bullying. *British Journal of Management, 21*, 453-468. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00664x

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations software of the mind.* New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Johnston, P., Schimmel, T., & O'Hara, H. (2010, Spring). Revisiting the AAUP recommendation: Initial validation of a university faculty model of collegiality. *College Quarterly*, *13*(2).

Keashley, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2010). Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *32*(1), 48-70. doi:10.2753/ATP1084-1806320103

Keashley, L., & Nowell, B. L. (2011). Conflict, conflict resolution, and bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 423-446). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Liefooghe, A. P. D., & Davey, K. M. (2001). Accounts of workplace bullying: The role of the organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4), 375-392. doi: 10.1080/13594320143000762

MacIntosh, J. (2006). Tackling work place bullying. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 27*, 665-69. doi; 10.1080/01612840600642984

Matthiesen, S. B., Bjorkelo, B., & Burke, R. (2011). Workplace bullying as the dark side of whistleblowing. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*(2nd ed., pp. 301-324). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

McKay, R., Arnold, D., Fratzl, J., & Thomas, R. (2008). Workplace bullying in academia: A Canadian study. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal, 20*(2), 77-100. doi:10.1007/s10672-008-9073-3

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). *The bully at work*: *What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job.* Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2011). *The bully-free workplace*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Nelson, E. D., & Lambert, R. D. (2001). Sticks, stones and semantics: The ivory tower bully's vocabulary of motives. *Quantitative Sociology*, *24*, 83-106.

O'Meara, K. A. (2004). Beliefs about post-tenure review: The influence of autonomy, collegiality, career stage, and institutional context. *Journal of Higher Education*, *75*, 175-202.

Patton, M. Q. (2002).*Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Raineri, E. M., Frear, D. F. & Edmonds, J. J. (2011). An examination of the academic reach of faculty and administrator bullying. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(12), 22-35.

Rayner, C. (1998). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Psychology, 7*(3), 199-209.

Rayner, C., & Lewis, D. (2011). Managing workplace bullying: The role of policies. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 327-340). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and process in the work environment. *Human Relations, 56*(10), 1213-1232. doi: 10.1177/00187267035610003

Salin, D. & Hoel, H., (2011). Organisational causes of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 227-243). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Simpson, R., & Cohen, C. (2004). Dangerous work: The gendered nature of bullying in the context of higher education. *Gender, Work & Organization, 11*(2), 163-186. doi: 10.1111/j. 1468-0432.2004.00227

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Sutton, R. (2007), *The No Asshole Rule.* New York, NY: Business Plus.

Theilen, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Twale, D., & DeLuca, B. M. (2008). *Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vartia, M., & Leka, S. (2011). Interventions for the prevention and management of bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 359-379). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Washburn, J. (2011). Academic freedom and the corporate university. *Academe, 97*(1), 8-13.

Weiner, D. (2002). *Power freaks: Dealing with them in the workplace or anyplace*. New York, NY: Prometheus Books.

Wilson, R. (2010, August 12). What Killed Kevin Morrissey? *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com

Yamada, D. C. (2000). The phenomenon of workplace bullying and the need for status-blind hostile work environment protection. *Georgetown Law Journal*, *88*, 475-536.

Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in the workplace: Recent trends in research and practice—An introduction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *10*(4), 369-373. doi: 10.1080/13594320143

Appendix A

Letter to Chief Academic Officer (CAO)

Dear <<name>>,

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of St. Thomas about to begin the research stage of my dissertation. The purpose of my study is to examine the phenomenon of workplace bullying as it pertains to faculty relationships. I am particularly interested in academic leaders' responses to instances of bullying that involve faculty. My research will focus on learning gained from these experiences and on identifying possible themes that may prove helpful in the future.

Workplace bullying is characterized by "verbal abuse, conduct or behaviors that are threatening, intimidating, or humiliating; or sabotage that prevents work getting done" (Namie & Namie, 2009). My own experience as a CAO and conversations I have had with CAO colleagues over the last three years would indicate that workplace bullying is not uncommon between and among faculty. The focus of the research will be on exploring and understanding how CAOs and others in their institutions have dealt with cases of workplace bullying.

I am looking for CAOs to participate in my study. Once identified, I will ask for additional names of two to three faculty or staff who may have observed or been involved with cases of bullying. Participants will be asked to take part in a 45-60 minute interview, and perhaps a follow-up interview. The interviews will likely be conducted in late April or early May. Participation in the study is voluntary and carries no remuneration. All aspects of the data gathered and descriptions of the institutions will be disguised and all interviews will be confidential.

Although we may have talked about this informally in the past, this is my formal request for your help. I hope you will be willing to help me with this project. If so, please contact me via email or phone. We can talk then about any questions you might have, additional people whom I may contact, and other details such as consent forms and interview protocols.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best Regards,

Colleen Hegranes
Doctoral Candidate
University of St. Thomas
Organization Learning and Development
(651) 485-4622 cahegranes@gmail.com

Appendix B

CONSENT FORM

UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS

Leadership Response to Workplace Bullying in Academe:

An Interpretive Case Study

IRB log #320594-1

I am conducting a research study related to workplace bullying in higher education, specifically instances of faculty-to-faculty bullying. I am particularly interested in understanding how Chief Academic Officers or other institutional leaders respond to these situations. I invite you to participate in this research. You have been selected as a possible participant because of your leadership role in a college or university and your probable involvement situations involving faculty incivility or bullying. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate in this study.

Background Information:
The purpose of this research is to examine and understand university leadership actions and responses to bullying behaviors in faculty. My intention is to understand the experience of leaders dealing with faculty who are bullies and the targets of bullies. Through the study of college or university senior administrators, this research will attempt to understand and describe how senior administrators address instances of workplace bullying between faculty.

Procedures:
If you agree to participate, I will ask you to do the following:

1. Participate in a single interview of approximately 45-60 minutes conducted by me either in person or by phone, whichever is most convenient for you.
2. Identify two to three additional individuals at your institution whom I may contact. These would be individuals who have observed or been involved with cases of bullying.
3. Give your permission to me record your interview. This will be used in transcription and both will be destroyed at completion of the study.

Risks and Benefits:
The risks involved with participation in this study are no more than one would experience in regular daily life. There is no financial compensation for participating in this study.

Confidentiality:
Pseudonyms will be assigned to protect your identity and that of your institution. Neither the dissertation nor any subsequent publications will contain information that would

identify you or your institution. Data collected will be kept in a password protected file and will be destroyed upon successful completion of the dissertation.

Voluntary Nature of the Research:
Your participation in the study is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer specific questions as you wish. You may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. If you withdraw, all data collected from you will be eliminated from the study.

Contact and Questions:
This study will be conducted by Colleen Hegranes, a doctoral candidate at the University of St. Thomas. If you have questions now or at any time during the study, you may contact me at cahegranes@gmail.com or 651.485.4622.

You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Alla Heorhaidi at aheorhiadi@stthomas.edu or 651.962.4457 or the University of St. Thomas Institutional Review Board at 651.962.5341.

Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I consent to participate in this research and to be audio-taped during the interview.

_____

Signature of Research Participant Date

_____

Printed Name of Research Participant Date

_____

Signature of Researcher (Colleen Hegranes) Date

Appendix C

Participant Interview Guide

Workplace bullying is defined as "the repeated, health-harming mistreatment of an employee by one or more employees through acts of commission or omission manifested as: verbal abuse; behaviors–physical or nonverbal–that are threatening, intimidating, or humiliating; work sabotage, interference with production; exploitation of a vulnerability—physical, social or psychological; or some combination of one or more categories" (Namie and Namie, 2009).

1. Please tell me about your experience with situations of workplace bullying between or among faculty:
    a. How did you become aware of the situation?
    b. What behaviors were reported or observed?
    c. Were there other observers?
    d. What were the inherent challenges in regard to the faculty members' status?
    e. How did you respond?

2. What challenges did you face? How did you react personally and professionally?

3. What remedies were available to you, e.g., institutional policies, disciplinary routes, etc.?

4. In hindsight, what did you learn from the situation? What would you do differently in the future? What does the institution need to do?

5. Is there any other insight or observation you would like to add?

Appendix D

Secondary Participant Interview Guide

Workplace bullying is defined as "the repeated, health-harming mistreatment of an employee by one or more employees through acts of commission or omission manifested as: verbal abuse; behaviors–physical or nonverbal–that are threatening, intimidating, or humiliating; work sabotage, interference with production; exploitation of a vulnerability—physical, social or psychological; or some combination of one or more categories" (Namie and Namie, 2009).

1. Please tell me about your experience observing situation(s) of workplace bullying between or among faculty:
    a. How did you become aware of the situation?
    b. What behaviors did you observe?
    c. How did you respond?
2. From your perspective, was the CAO's response effective?
3. What do you think should have been done?
4. What should the institution do about situations like this?
5. Is there any other insight or observation you would like to add?